

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

O. 2.

MAY, 1930.

VOL. XX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

THE ADVANCE OF MODERNISM IN THE ROMAN CHURCH.

The April number of the *Review of the Churches* contains an article by Mr. Arnold Lunn which deserves to be widely read. The article is entitled 'Bibliolatry and Mr. Belloc.'

From this it appears that Mr. Belloc, the most influential of Roman Catholic laymen in England, in his new book, *Survivals and New Arrivals*, fearlessly expounds the Modernist doctrine of Holy Scripture. Mr. Belloc liberates the Roman Catholic from believing in the plenary verbal inspiration of Scripture and its historical accuracy. The Roman Catholic layman, according to Mr. Belloc, accepts the Old Testament in so far as his Church commands him to do so. He is, however, free to reject any particular incident which the Church has not expressly declared as authentic. The Roman Catholic need not believe in Noah and the Whale, the Garden of Eden, or Balaam's Ass.

This is indeed a liberating word, a word which Professor St. George Mivart, Lord Acton, and many another liberal Roman Catholic must have longed to hear, but alas! did not hear it.

It is, according to Mr. Belloc, the evil influence of Protestantism which is responsible for the seeming, and indeed sometimes actual, Biblical Fundamentalism of Roman Catholicism in its attitude towards Holy Scripture. It is most important to put the saddle on the right horse. The new life of Galileo, based on much hitherto unpublished correspondence of the imprisoned astronomer, which may shortly be expected, will doubt-

less make this clear. It will show an as yet unknowing world that Galileo was a zealous and entirely orthodox Catholic who suffered imprisonment at the hands of a Protestant Inquisition on account of his orthodoxy. This is supported by the fact that the works of Copernicus, whose follower Galileo was, were removed from the *Index Expurgatorius*, in the nineteenth century, where they had been placed by the Protestantism of an earlier age. Very surprising to-day are the reversals of tradition which the whirligig of historical research presents to the truth-seeking historian, and which he with modest and sincere conviction transmits to his eager and grateful Athenian public. The sons of Balliol, thanks to the spirit which Benjamin Jowett kindled in that illustrious place of sound learning, are still leaders in the sphere of liberal theology. It is therefore not unnatural, though to some it may be surprising, that Mr. Belloc should be among the prophets.

It is this Protestant Fundamentalism, with its Semitic ancestry, that Mr. Belloc so stoutly opposes, which has wretchedly hindered the popular acceptance of the results of scientific research in Protestant countries, but is now, thanks to the advance of Catholic culture, happily declining. Many Protestants are quite unaware of this. So often do we fail to see Roman Catholic influence operating where, if we were not prejudiced, we should recognize it.

Although 'men of Catholic culture' have long since disdained to wear what Thomas Carlyle called 'Jewish old clothes' unfortunately even to-day eminent Protestants have not entirely discarded them. Mr. Belloc, with his keen insight, points to the sartorial habit as existing where many would have least expected it. Dr. Gore, the editor of *Lux Mundi*, who was supposed to have led Anglo-Catholicism out of the desert of fundamental Biblical Literalism into the Canaan of modern Biblical Criticism, does himself wear these Jewish old clothes, of course in an attenuated form. We do not suppose they can be more voluminous than the garment of camel's hair, or even the leather girdle worn by St. John the Baptist—and these too worn only as undergarments—yet Mr. Belloc with his uncanny insight sees the staring him in the face. He writes :—

'Dr. Gore, a man of the highest cultivation, was lately careful to distinguish between the story of Jonah and the Whale and the mira-

of our Lord; the first he reverently abandoned, the second he deferentially admitted. We must recognize that the bare existence of such an attitude is a serious proof that literalism still has some vitality; even in Europe, or, at any rate, in this country.'

erily the Spirit has descended on the Prophet of Catholic Culture. Our Anglican Moses must die with only a Pisgah-view of the Promised Land. It is the privilege of Hilaire Ben Nun to lead the Chosen People, 'the men of Catholic culture,' into the rich Biblical pastures—which modern historical and literary criticism offers them—flowing with the milk of Wellhausen and the honey of Harnack. But Mr. Belloc is not alone; he has his Caleb, the distinguished Dominican, Father Hugh Pope, who is doing such good work among the undergraduates of Oxford, and has written a *Catholic Student's Aid to the Study of the Bible*. It is the new edition (as yet unpublished) of this book, which according to Mr. Arnold Lunn, gives authoritative ecclesiastical support to the prophetic utterances of Mr. Belloc. We expect to read this new edition with profound interest, and let us add as Modernists, with profound gratitude. Of Rome, we may say, as Galileo said of the earth, *e pur si muove*. Fundamentalism belongs to the past; bibliolatrous literalism lies dying, not simply in Dayton, Ohio, but in the seminaries of Latin Christendom; the reign of the Spirit predicted by Joachim of Flora, and to say the prophet Joel, draws nigh. There is great need for thankfulness. They, who sowed in tears, will not themselves reap in joy—that is not the privilege of the precursors, for it is not the method of the Divine order—but others will do so throughout the broad fields of the *Pax Romana*.

No doubt, Rome—it is the Roman fashion—will conceal, as best she can, the fact that her teaching has changed in the sphere of Biblical exegesis. The tremendous declarations in the Encyclical of Leo XIII will be veiled in decent obscurity like the more famous declarations of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, to which the modern successor of Pope Boniface VIII has not appealed in diplomatic negotiations with Mussolini. These things, like the stone and sling with which David slew Goliath, are laid up in the Armoury of the Palace Beautiful as curiosities for the delectation of pilgrims. They have served their purpose in the spiritual warfare of the past, but Israel's warriors use them no more when the Ark goes forth to battle against the Philistines.

Yet because there is inspiration in all proofs of progress, and not least of all in the proofs that the Church of Rome, whose motto has been claimed to be *Semper eadem*, is herself progressing, we think well, following the example of Mr. Arnold Lunn, to cite what, for this purpose, is the operative clause in the Encyclical of Leo XIII, and having cited it, to recognize with rejoicing how far, in the name of Catholic culture, Mr. Hilaire Belloc and Father Hugh Pope have advanced beyond it.

'It is absolutely wrong either to limit inspiration to certain portions only of the Bible, or to concede that the sacred authors themselves have erred . . . indeed, so far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with Inspiration that, on the contrary, Inspiration is not only essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true . . . For by His supernatural power the Holy Spirit so moved and impelled them to write, was so present with them, whilst they wrote, that all that He bade them write and that only, they first of all rightly understood, then willed faithfully to write down, and finally expressed in fitting words and with infallible truth. Otherwise, it could not be said that the Holy Spirit was the Author of the whole of Holy Scripture.'

There is in this Roman *volte-face* a warning for our own English reactionaries who would reject the best that the English Church of to-day has to give in favour of the obscurantism from which the more enlightened spirits in the Roman Church are striving to escape. We recall the understanding exclamation of the Roman Catholic scholar who had been listening with patient attention to an extreme Anglo-Catholic's exposition of the aims of Anglo-Catholicism.

'Ah! I see, you wish to bring into your Church those things from which we wish to free ours.'

Pass on, men of the Catholic culture, led by Mr. Belloc and Father Pope, and show an obscurantist, faithless, Protestant generation what a sound Modernism can do to renew the spiritual life of the Western world.

THE BISHOP OF TRURO *versus* THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM.

The judgment of Mr. Justice Bennett in the High Court, in the suit brought by the Bishop of Truro and others against the Bishop of Birmingham, appeared to be a foregone conclusion in the light of the refusal of Dr. Barnes to plead. As a consequence the Bishop is ordered to admit and license to a cure of souls the clergyman, whom he has said he will not institute, unless he be

assured that he will accept his ruling on Reservation of the sacrament.

The *Guardian* expressed the opinion, after the delivery of judgment, that the Bishop of Birmingham had landed himself the horns of a dilemma. We venture to think, if the mixed metaphor may be pardoned, that the boot is on the other foot. Already the Bishop of Truro's action has created deep misgiving in Anglo-Catholic circles, and his legal victory, if pressed, will prove a Pyrrhic one. The more reasonable Anglo-Catholics recognize, and they are an influential element in their party, that Dr. Barnes has been condemned, not because he declined to institute, but because he declined to plead in the High Court. Should Dr. Frere take the next legal step, Dr. Barnes will be attached for contempt of Court, and be sent to prison; thus will this fearless antagonist of sacramental superstition in the English Church, attain—what a printer's error once described as 'the *gaol* of his desires.' Thus also will he be following in the steps of the Anglo-Catholic leaders of the last generation, who gained not a little for their cause by their willingness to suffer imprisonment for conscience's sake.

As the result of such a *dénouement*, minor issues will be ignored and the conflict will assume national proportions. Protestantism in the person of its imprisoned champion will once again be seen fighting for its life against an insidious and subtle Romanism. Ever since Bishops Latimer and Ridley lighted their candle in Broad Street, Oxford, courage and candour, constancy and consistency, in religion have never failed to secure a deep response from the English people.

We cannot think that the imprisonment of the Bishop of Birmingham at the instance of the Bishop of Truro, in order to compel him to act contrary to his conscience, can either strengthen the Church with the nation or profit the Anglo-Catholic party. The Bishop of Birmingham declared openly long before legal proceedings were taken against him by the Bishop of Truro, that there were two things he could not do conscientiously.

(1) He must refuse to sanction the practice of Reservation for purposes of adoration. This refusal required him in the case of any parish church in his diocese where the Reserved Sacrament had been used for this purpose, to require from any clergyman presented to him for institution to that benefice an assur-

ance that he was prepared to obey the Bishop's ruling in this matter. In taking this line the Bishop has the support of a resolution passed by the majority of the Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation which decided 'that the Bishops in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion, which belongs to each in his own diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the book of 1928.' This, as the present Archbishop of Canterbury pointed out, meant that discretion remains with the Bishop in each diocese. It is for him to decide in any particular case how far he may think it right to follow the guidance of these proposals.

(2) The second thing which Dr. Barnes declared he could not conscientiously do, was to defend himself in a civil court against those who would compel him as a bishop to act against his conscience. His conception of the spiritual character of the Episcopal office absolutely forbade his yielding to this form of pressure.

Although we do not hold this view of the authority of English bishops in relation to the civil courts, inasmuch as all persons whether ecclesiastical or civil are subject to the Crown, and have the right to appeal to it, if they feel justice is not being done, and the Crown when appealed to must give its judgment through the decisions of the Courts of Law, which courts, since their decisions are determined by rational and moral principles, are for us as spiritual as the ecclesiastical courts, yet it is amazing that an Anglo-Catholic bishop, like Dr. Frere, should sue his brother-bishop, and that not in an ecclesiastical court, and by this means challenge Dr. Barnes' conviction of the spiritual character of the Bishop's authority and his right, as a Bishop, to act in accordance with his conscience. If a suit against the Bishop seemed absolutely necessary, then what Anglo-Catholic could doubt that the ecclesiastical court—the Arches' Court of the Archbishop—was the proper place in which to have the issue tried, and not the High Court.

Dr. Frere attempts to defend his action in a long letter (published in *The Times* of April 23rd) on the ground that the recourse to the law courts 'was justified, because there were no directly spiritual interests involved.' This seems to us an amazing defence and to add to the rankness of his offence. A cure of souls, to which Dr. Barnes refused to institute the clergyman in

question, is as spiritual a thing as exists, and certainly to assure oneself beforehand of the manner in which the priest in such a care of souls will discharge the pastoral office is an important spiritual duty incumbent on the Bishop to whom he is presented in institution. It is not because there are temporal interests involved in the transaction that therefore the spiritual interests are neglected. Were an Anglo-Catholic bishop to refuse to institute a Modernist clergyman to a benefice because he believed on his conscience the clergyman to be heretical, we doubt if Anglo-Catholics would feel that there were no directly spiritual interests involved, and that therefore the Bishop ought to institute, and that if he refused, the Modernist would have the right to bring an action in the High Court to compel him. Certainly if Anglo-Catholics do take such a view to-day, they have deserted their former standpoint. As Modernists we cannot condemn them for having changed their convictions. Indeed that Anglo-Catholic bishop of Dr. Frere's eminence should recognize the jurisdiction of the civil courts in an ecclesiastical cause seems to promise a return to the pre-Tractarian conviction of the sacred character of both State and Church, and that the Sovereign and his judges are as sacred in their functions as are bishops and curates in theirs, the purpose of all being the establishment of the Divine Rule in human society.

We observe in the Rev. G. D. Rosenthal, the leader of the Birmingham 'rebel' clergy, a similar tendency to that revealed in Dr. Frere. He, to judge from the report of his speech in the *Birmingham Post* of May 1st, is of opinion that what is legal in the Church must be decided, not by the unsupported utterance of a bishop, presumably his own, but by the law courts. It would greatly facilitate the difficulties connected with order in the Church to-day, if this view became general; for presumably those who are anxious to know what is lawful are equally anxious to obey it when it is made known to them. The question which is at issue in Mr. Rosenthal's mind is the lawfulness of Reservation. Bishop Stubbs, of Oxford, no mean authority, declared it to be unlawful, so also has the Dean of Arches, Sir Lewis Dibdin, but presumably Mr. Rosenthal will not be satisfied with such opinions, but desires the decision of a judge of the High Court. No Modernist would object to a friendly suit to secure an interpretation of Church law by such an authority. The

Evangelicals, to judge by recent statements in the *Morning Post*, seem to share Mr. Rosenthal's desire, so we may shortly look for the initiation of legal proceedings to secure it. We sincerely hope that it may make for peace and order in the Church. Although Bishops, for whom we have the highest personal regard, have been trying to secure order without calling in such aid, it might be a good thing if they did, for as St. Paul says, 'these, having no law, are a law unto themselves,' and this either leads to clerical lawlessness or encourages episcopal absolutism, both of which states conflict with that English constitutional ideal which aims at a profitable combination of order and freedom which last, if it be not the freedom of the Spirit, is to be found only in a system of carefully defined and rigidly protected rights.

THE SOUTH INDIA REUNION SCHEME.

Many are the letters, pamphlets, and pronouncements which the South India Reunion Scheme has called forth. They equal in quantity, if not in quality, the harvest of Kikuyu declarations. They are mainly intended to influence the judgment of the Lambeth Conference. It is more than doubtful whether they will influence judgment in South India, where practical needs rather than ecclesiastical theories constitute the centripetal forces.

Besides the utterances of Bishop Gore, Bishop Palmer, and Bishop Headlam, we have the illuminating contributions of Archdeacon Hunkin and Canon N. P. Williams, and the judicious considerations propounded by Canon Goudge and Archdeacon Rawlinson. A contribution, signed by a number of Modernist and Liberal Evangelical Churchmen, deserves a place in our pages, as it summarizes concisely and correctly, so it seems to us, the ancient historic background against which the South India proposals should be seen. We venture therefore to publish it here in full with its signatures. It is entitled *The Ministry in the Early Church—an Argument from History*.

SIR,

No greater or more urgent question has come before our day and generation than that of Christian Unity: and with the question, by the providence of God, there comes a greater opportunity of solution than has hitherto occurred, or is likely to occur again, if neglected.

Nothing, we believe, would be in itself more according to the will of God, or more likely to convince mankind of the relevance of Christianity to the great contemporary world issues than a courageous and sus-

tained movement towards the re-uniting of Christendom. Indications of increased desire for mutual understanding have multiplied among established communions, and reintegration has already taken place on a large scale in Canada and Australia, in English Methodism, and in the Church of Scotland. Urgent demand is now being made by young communities in different parts of the mission field, particularly in Persia, India, and China, for the removal of the scandal of a divided witness in non-Christian lands. It is from the mission field that matters are being brought to an issue for the Anglican Church. The South India Church Union Scheme, which seeks to translate into action the Appeal for Unity made by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, will be before the bishops of the whole Anglican Communion in the Lambeth Conference of 1930. They will then have to decide upon a line of policy which in its ultimate issue may largely determine the future of Christendom.

The present situation appears to us sufficiently to resemble that in which the Church found itself in the first and second centuries as to arouse the hope that the actual process by which fusion then took place may be repeated in our own day. This is good reason for studying afresh in the light of recent research the development of the ministry in the early Church, because some of the greatest practical difficulties of the present time are those which concern the ministry.

The fact of an actual succession in ministry from Apostolic times cannot now be fairly disputed. But this succession, where it existed, was a succession of presbyter-bishops (*Acts* xx, 17, 28), not of monarchical bishops. It was not until well into the second century that a ministry of succession, receiving its authority through the ordering of a monarchical episcopate, by natural expansion or express adoption, became nearly universal in the Church. This expansion and final adoption was promoted and demanded by the special circumstances of the time—the growth of heresy and the stress of persecution.

The later theory of Apostolic Succession had its root in the belief that its purpose was to secure and transmit sacramental grace. It is quite clear, however, that the primary purpose of the ministry was to maintain order and discipline, and to secure continuance of the preaching of the Word—the teaching of Jesus and concerning Jesus. An official ministry responsible for its own succession was, and is, in a stronger position to do these things than a ministry popularly appointed. It is equally clear that this original function was considered of chief importance till late in the second century, appeal to the fact of episcopal successions being cited as a witness, not to the transmission of grace, but to continuous teaching of the same doctrine of Christ. Important as the sacraments of the Gospel were in the life of the primitive Church, the normal restriction of administration to the minister was originally a matter of seemliness and Church order. Baptism has never yet been completely restricted to the clergy, and the possibility of lay administration of the Eucharist was not ruled out even at the close of the second century.

The claim that a particular pattern of ministry was necessary to the gift of God's grace in the sacraments was formulated later and defined to safeguard the official ministry of the Church, just as a dogma of verbal inspiration was propounded to safeguard the canonical Scriptures. These dogmas, perhaps natural under earlier conditions of thought and life, cannot to-day be maintained, and in particular it is impossible as it is impious to deny reality to the sacraments of non-episcopal ministries.

In view of these considerations we feel bound to urge that there is no true ground of objection to be raised on these issues to the ministerial union of the Anglican with Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist communions on the basis of the common acceptance of the ancient threefold ministry; and that there should be no real ground of offence to Christian consciences in such provision for interim periods before all ministries have come to be episcopally ordained as is intended in the South India Church Union Scheme. The widespread present readiness at home and abroad to make episcopacy a rallying point of union (so long as it is unencumbered with traditionalist dogmatism) gives to the Anglican Communion a special opportunity and responsibility. The Anglican view of orders since the Reformation has not been bound in theory or in practice to such an idea of validity as denies to those not episcopally ordained a true ministry of Word and Sacrament.

The Church of England, with its ancient episcopate on the one hand, and on the other its recognition of the moral and spiritual validity of the varied ministries of the Reformed Churches, is therefore in a position to contribute invaluable help to the wide movement towards unity, and it is our sincere hope that the effort now being made to form a united Church in South India on an episcopal basis will not fail to secure whole-hearted support where it has the best right to look for it.

We are, Sir your obedient servants,

ARTHUR F. ALSTON, JOHN N. BARRAN, A. BAINES, F. R. BARRY, J. F. BETHUNE BAKER, R. BLAKENEY, H. E. D. BLAKISTON, R. BROOK, V. J. K. BROOK, F. C. BURKITT, R. J. CAMPBELL, A. J. CARLYLE, R. H. CHARLES, G. A. CHASE, GILBERT COLERIDGE, H. COSTLEY-WHITE, G. G. COULTON, W. L. PAIGE COX, J. M. CREED, R. S. CRIPPS, H. P. CRONSHAW, D. DAWSON-WALKER, PERCY DEARMER.

W. MOORE EDE, P. GARDNER-SMITH, J. P. GORDON, J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, P. J. HEAWOOD, A. D. HENWOOD, F. B. HEISER, H. ST. B. HOLLAND, R. T. HOWARD, G. J. HOWSON, G. F. IRWIN, HEWLETT JOHNSON, W. GUY JOHNSON, R. B. JOLLY, R. H. KENNETT, J. B. LANCELOT, HENRY M. LAWSON, A. B. G. LILLINGSTON, W. W. LONGFORD, A. O. LUKYN-WILLIAMS, G. C. L. LUNT, PAT MCCORMICK, A. J. M. MACDONALD, W. H. MACKEAN, H. D. A. MAJOR, C. H. S. MATTHEWS, W. R. MATTHEWS, R. A. MITCHELL, W. D. MORRISON, W. E. R. MORROW, CYRIL NORWOOD, M. W. PATTERSON, C. E. RAVEN, J. H. RICHARDS, M. R. RIDLEY, T. GUY ROGERS, C. F. RUSSELL, T. R. SALE, G. F. SAYWELL, W. MARSHALL SELWYN.

ALBERT C. SEWARD, L. G. M. SHELDON, D. C. SIMPSON, VERNON F. STORR, W. S. THATCHER, J. H. THORPE, G. C. TURNER, A. V. VALENTINE-RICHARDS, C. S. WALLIS, R. WATERFIELD, E. W. WATSON, C. C. J. WEBB, W. WELCHMAN, J. E. C. WELLDON, BP., J. L. WHITE, A. T. P. WILLIAMS, CECIL W. WILSON, E. S. WOODS, C. S. WOODWARD.

We regret greatly that Sir Henry Lunn, the large-minded and self-sacrificing creator and able editor of that constructive quarterly, *The Review of the Churches*, which has made the reunion of Christendom its objective, is resigning his post.

THE JESUS OF HISTORY AND THE CHRIST OF FAITH*

By PROFESSOR MAURICE GOGUEL, D.Litt., D.Th., D.D., École des Hautes Études and Faculté Libre de Théologie Protestante, Paris, author of *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* (5 vols.), *Le Texte et les Éditions du Nouveau Testament*, etc.

TRANSLATED BY THE REV. C. J. WRIGHT, B.D.

ARTICLE I.

THE terms of the problem to which I wish to draw your attention are sufficiently indicated by the very name 'Jesus Christ.' This, according to current usage, is a proper name, and the majority of people say indifferently Jesus Christ, Jesus, Christ or the Christ, just as they say Cæsar or Julius Cæsar, or, if we are not to leave the domain of primitive Christianity, just as the New Testament calls indifferently the traditional redactor of our second Gospel Mark or John Mark. If, however, we return to the original meaning of the terms, we see that the association of the names Jesus and Christ is a fact of a quite distinct order which is in no wise comparable to the ordinary usage, so current in New Testament times, of double names such as Saul Paul or Joseph Barnabas.

Jesus is a proper name which belonged to many Jews. The New Testament speaks to us of a certain Jesus Justus, and the robber Barabbas whose liberation was demanded of Pilate by the crowd seems to have been called Jesus Barabbas. In the century between 35 B.C. and 63 A.D. there were not less than four Jewish High Priests who bore this name, and it is sufficient to glance at the table of proper names which Niese has given in his edition of the works of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus to be convinced that it was a fairly common name.

Christ on the contrary is the Greek translation of the Hebrew *māshīyah*, which signifies 'the Anointed One.' It is not a proper name, it is the designation of an office. The Messiah to the Israelites was in origin the name given to the Messianic king descended from David who would restore in its integrity the national and political independence of Israel and would assure

* Lecture delivered at Liège and Brussels in February, 1929.

her supremacy over rivals and neighbours, indeed over all the peoples of the earth. It suffices to recall here the main lines of the evolution of the notion of Messiah and how in proportion as experience rendered more and more chimerical and vain the hope of the restoration of an independent Israelite royalty by the mere play of political events, the Jewish hope, the surrender of which was forbidden by her indefectible faith in her God, became more and more transcendent. That is to say, it came to rely no longer on political combinations or on fortunate wars, but on a supernatural intervention of God on behalf of His people, just as in place of the idea of a re-establishment of order on the earth there was substituted little by little that of the annihilation of the actual world, definitively condemned because subject to the power of Satan, and its replacement by an entirely new economy which was described as 'The Kingdom of Heaven.' By this descriptive phrase must not be understood a Kingdom in the heavens, but the Reign of Him who is in the heavens whom the Jews did not dare to name out of respect for His majesty. Since then, the Messiah is the transcendent being by whom this radical transformation will be realized, He it is whom God will send to annihilate His enemies and to execute judgment.

This evolution was almost completed at the time when Jesus appeared. The affirmation, 'Jesus is the Messiah,' or, under the Greek form which prevailed, 'Jesus is the Christ,' in which was summed up the faith of the primitive Church, is the affirmation that Jesus was not only as the apostle Paul said, a man 'born of a woman, born under the law' (*Gal. iv, 4*), but that He was more, not only a prophet sent and inspired by God, a revealer of His will and of His redemptive plan, but in addition a supernatural being descended from heaven.

The witness of the New Testament is on this point so explicit and so clear that there can remain no doubt as to the character of the primitive Christian faith. Paul affirms that Christ is the 'second Adam' (*I Cor. xv, 45*), 'the man from heaven' (*I Cor. xv, 47, 48*), that he was 'in the form of God' (*Phil. ii, 6*), that he has received 'the name of *Kurios*' (*Phil. ii, 9-11*), that is Lord, the word which the Greek version of the Old Testament uses to translate the sacred tetragrammaton, the ineffable name of God; He is 'the image of the invisible God' (*Col. i, 15*, and *II Cor. iv, 4*), 'through whom and unto whom were all things

created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible' (*Col.* i, 16), in whom finally 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (*Col.* ii, 9). The author of the epistle to the Hebrews declares that Christ is 'the effulgence of God's glory, the very image of His substance' (*Heb.* i, 3). The author of the Fourth Gospel affirms that before Abraham was, Christ was (*Jn.* viii, 48), that He came from heaven (*Jn.* iii, 13, 31; vi, 38). He also, taking up the concept of the divine Word elaborated by the Judeo-Hellenic philosophy of Alexandria in order to apply it to Christ, affirms that He was 'in the beginning,' that He is the divine Word without whom 'was not anything made that hath been made,' that He is the life and the light, that this divine Word became flesh and dwelt among His own who beheld in Him the glory of the only-begotten from the Father (*Jn.* i, 1-14). The evangelist Matthew believes that the presence of Christ among men can only be explained by the miracle of the supernatural birth. The author of the Apocalypse, finally, sets forth Christ as the object of the worship of the blessed in heaven, which proves that He was the object of the worship of the faithful on earth. To add to these testimonies of believers that of an outsider, Pliny the younger, describing to Trajan what he knows of the Christians, says that they 'sing hymns in honour of Christ as in honour of a God' (*Ep.* x, 96).

If primitive Christianity carefully preserved the memory of the terrestrial life of Jesus—a fact sufficiently evidenced by the existence of the Gospels and by the *rôle* they have played—if it attached the highest value to the fact that Jesus had lived as a man, it affirmed, on the other hand, no less plainly the transcendent character of the person of Christ; it saw in Him, in a sense unique and absolute, the Son of Man. In Christianity the term 'disciples' has always meant something more than in such expressions as the disciples of Plato and Aristotle. The disciples of Christ are not only those who have accepted and kept His teaching; they are those who worship Him.

To the witness of primitive Christianity might be added that of the doctrine and of the tradition of the Church, which affirm with absolute precision, at the same time the humanity and the divinity of Christ. The creeds of the ancient Church are on this point very explicit and, even if the theologians have at times emphasized the divinity of Christ in a way which tended,

to say the least, to obscure His humanity, nevertheless docetism—that is to say, the doctrine which reduced the humanity of Christ to a mere appearance—has always been condemned as a dangerous heresy. The Churches resulting from the Reformation on this point remained faithful to the dogmatic tradition of the ancient Church, not merely by declaring expressly in their confessions of faith that they recognize these creeds as valid, but also by direct affirmations such as this brief but categorical definition of Christ given by Luther in the *Little Catechism*: ‘True God-begotten of the Father through all eternity, true man, born of the Virgin Mary.’ Calvin writes similarly in the *Institutes* (ii, 12, 2): ‘Those who deprive Jesus Christ either of His divinity or of His humanity greatly diminish His majesty and glory and obscure His goodness and grace; while on the other hand they cause no less injury to those whose faith they overthrow, which faith can exist only as it rests upon this foundation.’

To Christianity Jesus is not only the initiator or the founder of a new religion. He is also its object. Christian thought, then, regards His person as at the same time in two different categories: in the category of humanity first of all because of His terrestrial life, His teaching and His death, and in the category of transcendent realities because of what He is for the faith of the Church.

There is a historical problem of Jesus. It exists apart from all interpretation and all religious preoccupation, not for believers only, but for everyone who concerns himself with the past of humanity.

To believers, whether they have remained faithful to the traditional formulas or have broken away from them, there is on the other hand a theological and religious problem of Christ. The theological problem is raised by the judgments which the Church has given on Christ and by the necessity there is to integrate the idea which we form of Him into a general conception. The religious problem results from the *rôle* which faith attributes to Him. It is raised by the fact that to believers Christ is not merely a magnitude of the past, but a power in the present, that He is, as has been said, ‘the eternal contemporary.’

The theological problem is a problem of speculation and of interpretation which can only be solved by the use of a very

general philosophic conception. The present state of minds and the disorder of systematic thought are not perhaps very favourable to its elucidation. We do not misunderstand its importance, but we think that it may without inconvenience be left here on one side.

The co-existence just stated of a historical problem of Jesus and a religious problem of Christ raises a third problem, that of the relation existing between these two. We cannot indeed—such is our belief—maintain that the historical problem of Jesus and the religious problem of Christ existing on two quite different planes can be and should be developed in perfectly independent ways, each following the laws and the methods germane to itself. If there are, indeed, various functions of the human mind, there are not between them water-tight partitions. The personality being a unity, that which is attained by each of the various developments of the life of the spirit must be harmonized. There are certainly contradictions and antinomies which the feebleness of the human mind cannot completely resolve. There are times when we seem to hold in our hands the two ends of a chain joined we do not see how. But the case before us is different. It has not to do with facts distinct from each other, but with a single fact in which contradictory characteristics cannot be recognized because we envisage it from two different points of view. The time is gone when it was possible to think that a thesis could be true in theology and false in philosophy, or *vice-versa*.

Religious thought can make, in the name of spiritual experience, of speculation, of mystic intuition, assertions about Christ which are not simply transpositions of the statements of history but which pass beyond them. There are theses which are essential for faith and which history cannot formulate, whether because it does not employ texts which justify them, or because by their very nature they elude its competence. We recognize, without any hesitation, that it is legitimate, that it is consonant with the nature of things, that religious thought passes beyond the affirmations of history and, if one may so speak, extends them. But we do not think it has the right to contradict them. An example will show what we have in mind. Let us take the idea of the perfect sinlessness of Christ. History cannot affirm that

Jesus was perfectly sinless. What it maintains is that in the consciousness of Jesus it does not discover any trace of the feeling of sin or of remorse—that His life produced on those who were its witnesses a unique impression. It may add that given the extreme delicacy of the moral consciousness of Jesus, the absence of the feeling of sin has with Him a quite particular importance. But that is only a negative fact, and except in very particular cases a negative fact does not authorize a positive conclusion. The argument *e silentio* is one of those which as a general rule should be most distrusted. It is necessary to add that our documents report only a very brief period of the life of Jesus, and that their composition might have been influenced by the fact that they were written in a *milieu* in which the sinlessness of Jesus was believed in. The historian must, then, confine himself to the refusal to deny this sinlessness. This fact, wholly negative as it is, permits the man of faith to make an assertion denied to the historian. But, on the other hand, we have not the right, in the name of considerations of a spiritual or speculative order, to affirm the omniscience or the inerrancy of Christ, or, at least, to speak with more prudence, we have the right to make this assertion only after establishing, by a purely historical demonstration, that Jesus did not hold views on the imminent end of the world which are attributed to Him by an increasingly great number of contemporary exegetes.

Our feeling that it is impossible to be satisfied with a conception according to which there might be developed along parallel lines a historical conception and a religious conception of Christ which would move on two different planes, without a necessary contact and harmony between them, corresponds with the traditional conceptions of the Church which affirms the identity of the Jesus who lived in Palestine and who died there in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius with the Eternal Christ.

To make conspicuous the evidence of this impossibility, it is sufficient to push the thought to a logical extreme and to ask what the consequences would be for Christianity conceived as a religion if this or that historical theory maintained by certain of our contemporaries, if such could or should be considered as historically demonstrated—the mythical theory, for example, of M. Couchoud, or that of M. Eisler, according to which Jesus

was a Messianic pretender and a political agitator who wished to rouse his people against the Roman rule. Could Christianity stand with such conceptions? Would it not suffer profound changes, which taken together would make of it something quite different from what it has been for nineteen centuries, and which would lead to nothing less than the substitution for it of a different religion? These would not profoundly affect it if it was a particular type of religious conception having its own value quite independent of the conditions in which it has been historically realized and of the person, real or fictitious, who was at its origin. These would do so if it was on all points comparable to a philosophic system, to a scientific theory, to a technical process of which it might be from certain points of view interesting to know when, by whom, and under what circumstances they were formulated or discovered, but which could be appreciated or criticized, utilized or rejected, without the personality of their inventor intervening in the appreciation or in the use made of them.

This conception of the essence of Christianity has first against it, it seems to me, the witness of the Christian consciousness which cannot, without losing its specific character, reduce its religion to a system of ideas and cannot make an abstraction of the person of Christ. Moreover, this so-called objective system of philosophical and theological ideas which would constitute Christianity does not exist in reality. The history of dogmas has shown, in a way we may hold as definitely settled, that into Christian doctrine have entered many elements not specifically Christian, and that on the other hand there is not a single theological and philosophical Christian system, but a series of different, and in certain of their elements even contradictory, systems. If it were by doctrine that Christianity could be defined it would not be primarily a religion. It would still be necessary to admit, since doctrine has varied, that Christianity as a religion has itself been transformed, as it is only its manifestations, its successive realizations which to a certain degree differ from each other. It is one of the most audacious paradoxes of the Roman Church which permits the denial of variations of Christian doctrine and the reduction of these to the simple stages of the definition of a doctrine, unchangeable in its essence.

Christianity is quite other than a doctrine; it is a form of religious life that can be characterized by saying that it consists of two elements, the one normative (that is to say, one which sets forth an ideal for realization), the other which we may call genetic or dynamic (that is to say, one which constitutes a power by which the normal relation of man with God, set forth as an ideal, may be realized). What in Christianity is most original is that the relation of the believer to his God is not an abstract and theoretical ideal, but a reality revealed and manifested in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The historical reality of this person thus assumed a capital importance with which cannot be compared, for example, the rôle of the person of Muhammad in Islam. The revelation on which Christianity rests cannot be sundered from the person of the revealer. It is not therefore possible for Christianity to disengage its interest from what Jesus in reality was.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

THE NEED FOR EUGENICS

By the Rev. R. V. G. TASKER, M.A., Rector of Chenies, Bucks.

ONE of the most dangerous perhaps of all human delusions is the doctrine of automatic progress, the view that life will naturally and inevitably become better as the years go on and as knowledge increases and civilization advances. Such a view found a good many advocates in the last century. It was an age of great discoveries and, for the most part, of great prosperity. Man was conscious of gaining an ever-increasing mastery over the natural world, and was becoming complacently optimistic in consequence. 'Leave things alone,' was the motto of many political thinkers, 'and everything will progress.' 'God's in His heaven; all's right with the world.' And yet was all well with the world? An age which believed itself to be travelling steadily on an upward path of progress suffered a severe shock to its pride and its philosophy when it awoke one day to find Europe plunged into the savage butchery of war, and to realize that the weapons of its own invention were turned against itself and threatened to destroy their inventors. No one

to-day is so foolish as to believe in any doctrine of *automatic* progress. Progress there may be, but it will only come as man himself has the desire, and the will, and the power to progress.

But along what lines can man work in order to bring about real progress in human life? There are two complementary answers to this question, one of which finds general acceptance to-day, while the other is more controversial and far less widely understood or believed in. There is, first, the pathway of Social Reform. In accordance with this view, man will progress just in so far as he improves the outward conditions of life, and just in so far as he can ameliorate the environment in which he lives by the provision of good houses, by the invention of labour-saving devices, by making the conditions of toil easier and more congenial, and by affording still greater opportunities for education.

And the second answer is contained in the words 'Eugenic Reform.' The word Eugenics was first used by Sir Francis Galton to describe the effort of mankind to improve his own race by ensuring that only as many children shall be born as can be properly cared for, and those only from the healthiest parents. Galton endeavoured to apply the laws of heredity to man just as Darwin had applied them to the world of animals. And it has been the conviction of all would-be Eugenic Reformers ever since Galton that without such reform as he advocated such social reforms as have been already achieved will not only be of little permanent value, but may ultimately prove to be positively harmful to the cause of true progress.

As we look back upon the history of the last hundred years one fact stands out quite clearly, and that is the enormous amount of effort and money which has been spent in the endeavour to improve the outward conditions under which man has to spend his four-score years upon this planet. It is certainly true that the conditions of labour are better and the opportunities for living a wide and interesting life far greater to-day than they have ever been before. And yet it is at least open to question whether the results have been as great as the amount of labour and effort expended might have led men reasonably to expect. There are at least two considerations which give grounds for hesitation and doubt. There is, first, the shortage of men and women of outstanding genius. Is it that democracy tends to

reduce everybody to a more or less similar level? Or are there other factors at work? And, secondly, there is the obvious fact that, in spite of all social reform, the asylums and prisons of our land are as full as ever.

In other words, there is much evidence to show that while man has been endeavouring to improve the conditions under which he has to live, he has not really succeeded in improving himself. On the contrary, there are no uncertain marks of racial degeneracy amongst us. And to those who take a long view this is the most alarming feature of our civilization, and hinders incalculably real and permanent progress. The law of the survival of the fittest, which tended to keep the human race strong and vigorous in its early days, is no longer operative to-day. On the contrary, much of the wealth of the nation is spent in keeping alive under as humane conditions as possible a large number of citizens who are able to contribute nothing to the life or welfare of the community, while the healthiest strains of the community are highly taxed and compelled to limit their families in order to provide the money for such expenditure. The very improvement, moreover, in the outward conditions of life renders it increasingly possible for the feeble-minded and the less healthy sections of the community not only to survive but to carry on the race. Parenthood as a result is becoming a more and more easy thing. There are State asylums, State schools, State clinics, all of which tend more and more to take away responsibility from parents' shoulders. The Eugenic Reformer does not for a moment suggest that these things ought not to be. All humanitarian and religious considerations force us to believe that it is our duty, once a child is born, to see that his passage through life is as tolerable as possible. But the Eugenic Reformer is forced to ask: Have we not come to a stage when we ought to take some steps to ensure that the wealth of the country will not have to be continually spent in such an unremunerative way? And this can only be done by creating a far greater 'racial conscience' amongst all classes in the community than exists at present and a far greater realization of our debt to the race unborn, and by taking legislative measures to ensure that the feeble-minded and the bearers of hereditary disease—who are found in every social class—are prevented from carrying on the

race. At present very little is done in this direction. It is a legitimate sneer that we take far greater pains in breeding race-horses than we do in producing a healthy human race. Marriage can be entered upon in this country very easily. No questions are asked as to the heredity or physical condition of the parties concerned, and in consequence the results are often tragic both to the individuals concerned and the community. Families intermarry sometimes for several generations without realizing that such a practice must produce degeneracy and insanity, if there be, as there probably is, some congenital weakness in them. Much indeed of the misery of the world is directly due to unwise marriage and to the indiscriminate birth of children, misery which, on the assumption that man is a rational animal, can and ought to be prevented.

But do we know enough of the laws of heredity to enable us to say with any degree of certainty or fairness what diseases are hereditary? It is true that the facts of heredity are still to a large extent undiscovered. Biologists are not agreed even upon such important questions as whether acquired characteristics are inherited or not; but we do know enough from a large body of ascertained facts to say quite definitely that certain forms of disease, such as epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, congenital deafness, will almost certainly be reproduced in future generations sooner or later. But it may be argued that in seeking to propagate the race only along physically healthy channels is there not a danger that genius will be more eliminated than ever? Is it not proverbial that genius is akin to madness and found often in most unexpected quarters? There is much evidence that genius has been found in those who are physically and mentally abnormal, but there is no evidence that genius has arisen in those who have been born from a tainted ancestry. Many of the world's greatest geniuses, particularly musicians, developed abnormalities in early years through excessive attention to one mental pursuit. This is the price that must be paid for genius.

No sane Eugenic Reformer imagines that the time is ripe or our knowledge sufficient for any '*positive*' eugenic programme. The idea that we can set to work to 'breed for points' is neither desirable nor practical. But there is a vast field in which race cleansing and a programme of '*negative*' eugenics is possible

and within the sphere of practical politics. The Eugenic Reformer would like to see a far greater segregation, and if necessary sterilization, of those who are the bearers of hereditary disease. He would also like to see the production of health certificates made an essential preliminary to marriage and the birth of legitimate children. This would involve no greater interference with personal liberty than is at present demanded by all Insurance Companies.

The Eugenic Reformer does not look, however, merely to legislative reform. He looks far more to the creation of an enlightened public opinion for the attainment of the object he has in view, for he realizes that it is impossible to legislate in advance of public opinion. And it is in this direction that all educated people can at once set to work. The days are gone when such vital questions as these were not talked about or left to a few specialists. They are the concern of all, and a democracy which tries to shelve them deserves to perish. Why, we ask, do nations decay? There is no automatic law of the rise and fall of nations. Nations decay when the healthy strains of the community are killed off by successive wars or do not for some reason or other play their part in carrying on the race. The two most urgent tasks which seem to confront our own country to-day are, first, the elimination of war, which under modern conditions is anti-eugenic, and the creation of healthy children. At present far too little is done by the State to encourage the middle-class parent to have more than two or three children, while everything is done to encourage the thriftless and the feeble-minded to add indiscriminately to their families.

Eugenic Reform is admittedly only possible upon the acceptance of the practice of birth control. Those who are opposed to the use of methods of birth control cannot contribute much to racial progress, and the Roman Church, so long as it regards birth control, save as achieved by abstention from sexual intercourse, as a sin, will remain one of the great anti-eugenic forces in modern civilization. Birth control is one of the facts of modern life. It has come to stay, and it is far too late in the day, even if it is desirable, to take up a merely negative attitude towards it. It is obvious that it has within it vast possibilities for good and evil, and the aim of the Eugenic Reformer is to

try and see that it shall not be used, as unfortunately at present owing to economic reasons it is being used, in the case of healthy parents, except for the spacing out of families, and to prevent the birth of those who would be ill-fitted and ill-equipped to face the struggle for existence. As in all moral issues, the motive underlying the use of birth control is the most important consideration.

The advocates of Eugenic Reform are met with opposition from three quarters. The advocates of Individualism are afraid of an undue interference with the liberty of the individual : but now that we have come to tolerate State interference in a multitude of comparatively unimportant matters, can there be any rational opposition to such interference in a matter which vitally concerns the State's very existence? Secondly, the advocates of Socialism are suspicious of eugenics because they imagine that the Eugenic Reformer seeks to breed only from one social class, and labour under the delusion that environment is the all-determining factor in human progress. The wisest Socialist thinkers, however, are more and more coming to see that if the State is to control to an increasing extent the life of such children as are born, it must ultimately claim the right also of saying who are and who are not to be the parents of those children. A Socialist State which is anti-eugenic is the one which is most liable to fall into racial decay.

Finally, the Eugenic Reformer is faced with some opposition from the sphere of Religion. There are simple people who take the view that all children are 'sent by God' and that we must accept the position as it is. The unscientific outlook is still common, though it is becoming increasingly less common amongst religious people. And one of the chief needs of the day is that scientific control should be accepted as expressing the Divine mind, where this scientific control is not in conflict with moral law. An intelligent Christian will not refuse to pay attention to the question of eugenic reform because there is nothing in the Bible about it. He will rather realize the truth of His Master's words : 'Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit : but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. Either make the tree good and his fruit good : or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt.'

THE PRACTICAL TASK OF THE MODERNIST IN THE PARISH*

SOMEONE has described the Book of Common Prayer as 'Catholic in essence, but Protestant by temporary necessity.' No doubt, as a statement of fact, many criticisms could be made of this; but as an epigram it is suggestive of truth and sums up a considerable period of history. I would suggest a similar *dictum* relative to the title of this paper. Many clergy to-day are Modernist by conviction, but Traditionalist by what they deem to be temporary necessities. In library and study they read Modernist literature with only an occasional question-mark pencilled in the margin to indicate less a view with which they disagree than one, perhaps, which they had not thought out before. In clerical study-circles and meetings they display and welcome a considerable freedom of thought and latitude of expression, thus giving to Modernist principles an experimental run as long as they are kept within the confines of the four walls—which, consequently, do 'a prison make.' For outside, there is a different world. In church and school and parish, their views become more rigid and their critical faculties close up like a concertina restricted to a smaller volume in order to prevent it from emitting too much noise. Their Modernism is due 'in the long run,' but for the present the time is not ripe, and the old shibboleths must be made to serve another turn. The leaven, apparently, works well enough in select samples, but who knows what it might do if placed in the whole lump!

That there is such a thing as a wise reticence, of course, all will admit. The person who will proclaim loudly and from the house-tops the latest theory of the critic as though it were the last word of the sage is less a Modernist than a Nihilist. Even God is supposed, proverbially, to temper the wind to the shorn lamb: and that at least suggests what man may well do. But the criticism suggested here is not—to change the metaphor—against regulating the pace of a march in order to allow for the

* A paper read before the Birmingham Society of Modernist Clergy by the Reverend J. P. Hodges, M.A., Senior Curate of the Parish Church of Birmingham.

slower walkers, but of abandoning the advance because the corns of a few make them hang back. If the Modernist faith is sound and wholesome, the scruples of a few cannot be allowed to retard its advance.

Yet this attitude of 'Modernism—but not in our day,' is often due to difficulties more genuine than the fear of treading upon religious corns; and it is the overcoming of these difficulties which constitutes the practical task of the Modernist in the parish. No one who has had any experience of parochial work will deny that there is a fundamental difference between the outlook of the parish and that of the college. And the change which one experiences in coming from the lecture-room to the pulpit is in many ways similar to that with which one has to deal in passing from the study-room to the sick bed of a parishioner. Put briefly, it implies the difference between theology and religion. No doubt from some points of view, that is a quibble. There can be no real antithesis between theology and religion, for the one needs the other in order to become articulate. A religion without a theology is 'a name without an echo.' What people object to is not theology as such, but bad theology or unintelligible theology. But though strictly speaking the implied difference is a quibble, yet at the same time it is a quibble which, like old soldiers, will never die. Presumably *they* live on because they are a part of the symbolism through which people view the past; so too, this difference between theology and religion stands for something real in the average person's outlook upon life. For him, theology usually implies the dry bones of a scholastic system; whereas by religion he means a personal attitude prompted by a spiritual experience. Hence he thinks of the former in terms of books and theories and arguments of which he has little knowledge and for which he has less love; when he talks of religion he refers to what God has or has not done in his life or in the life of some other.

This is only another way of saying that true religion must appeal not only to reason, but also to sentiment. That 'all religion is based in feeling' is, perhaps, an extreme statement which many would not accept: but undoubtedly, sentiment—in the finer sense of the word—has a real place in religion. And it is true that the average man approaches religion from the side of

sentiment, calling in his intellectual faculties to help him; whereas the student of theology necessarily approaches his subject from the intellectual side, appealing to experience to confirm or illustrate his theories. Hence the student can and does build up, modify or buttress, his convictions by the aid of argument and logic. The study is for him a laboratory wherein a critical appreciation of various ingredients goes to formulate his faith. But as he leaves his study for his parish, he must change also the ground of his argument: should he approach the parishioner with a display of logic he will probably fail to convince—and the smarter the logic, the more readily will a trap be suspected. Hence, to cope with this change of outlook is a very necessary part of the work of the Modernist in the parish. If he neglects it, he will find that in parochial life he is ‘entangled in a world of strife,’ and with George Herbert will murmur:

‘Now I am here, what thou wilt do with me
None of my books will show:
I read and sigh, and wish I were a tree;
For sure then should I grow
To fruit or shade: at least some bird would trust
Her household to me, and I should be just.’

But if treated with sympathy and spiritual understanding, may not this very divorce between religion and theology provide the Modernist with an opportunity not always open to others? His practical task is to make those dry bones live by breathing into them the new life which, under the guidance of the Spirit, is his possession. His opportunity is by his personal life and buoyant faith to show that the theology which he teaches and preaches is but the expression of the deep and earnest religion which guides his life. And in doing so he is less cumbered with the rigidity of a system than are they who look to the definitions of the past for an air of finality. He need make no appeal to cant phrase or badly worn *dictum*, but will so interpret present religious experience as to show its kinship with that of the saints. Creeds will be less a criterion of discipleship than an approximate summary of experience. No doubt in seeking to face up to problems, by stating them clearly, discarding the camouflage of unnecessary traditions and, where necessary, confessing a reverent agnosticism, he will encounter opposition. Like that early Modernist, Job, he will be hindered by those zealous Traditionalists who

prefer to cover up their problems rather than break loose from their moorings, or opposed by the modern Elihus who refuse to see that there is any problem at all. But there will be for him the deep satisfaction of showing religion as a quest and an adventure and of revealing the function of theology as offering a reliable, because recently revised, chart of progress.

I should like to emphasize my conviction that the success of a Modernist in a parish is very closely bound up with his capacity for spiritual leadership. His advent may introduce conflicting currents. On the one hand, he may be sure of that respect which Englishmen always pay their clergy. Spiritually as well as socially he is sure of a recognized place in the hearts of his people: they are prepared to listen to him and, if not to accept his opinions, yet to give them sufficient thought to criticize them. He is for them the representative of a world of spiritual things, and that carries with it both privilege and responsibility. It is not only his duty but his privilege to

‘ . . . see and tell
Of things invisible to mortal sight.’ (Milton)

On the other hand, rightly or wrongly the Modernist has acquired a reputation for intellectualism which is not always a commendation. It usually means an abnormal capacity for preaching above the heads of the congregation; and the age has gone by which considered that a mark of sound learning. It was of an eighteenth century character that John Buchan wrote:

‘The new Minister contrived to bring in much that did not belong to the divinity schools and he escaped criticism, it may be, because his Kirk Session did not understand him. His elders were noted theologians, and what was strange to them, if it was weightily phrased, they took for theological profundity.’

But in spite of this suspicion, large numbers expect and would welcome guidance and advice upon some of the difficult practical problems of the work-a-day world, and the Modernist parish priest who is sympathetic and spiritually-minded enough to give a lead in those affairs need fear little hostility to his principles. Rather, he is sure of the most glorious opportunity of proving up to the hilt the constructive value of a Modernist faith. When Charles Simeon was appointed Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, he was received with open hostility and contempt. But he laboured on diligently and faithfully until

eventually it could be said of him that 'his opinions were recognized as a School of Divinity.' Thus did he commend his theology through a life rich in religion; and then as now it was the religion which mattered.

What, then, should be the tactics of the parochial Modernist? After all, Modernism is not in itself a faith, nor a creed, but an outlook upon Christianity; and as such it has little scaffolding of its own to be erected before the building proper can be approached. The Modernist preacher has to unfold the Christian Gospel not as a creed to be learnt, but as a faith to be lived. For him certain great truths, certain fundamental principles, will stand out prominently as constituting the Art of Christian living; all else—precepts and traditions, doctrines and interpretations—will have only a relative importance. And since his exposition of these truths will at times necessarily differ from that traditionally received, he will seek every opportunity of elucidating his faith, with a view less to defending his position than of establishing its positive worth. And there are many avenues open to him which he will be wise to take. Personally, I believe that the pulpit, though a necessary means of disseminating the truth—and an inevitable one since Modernism cannot be put on and off like a garment—is the least advantageous place from which the Modernist outlook can be explained. For one thing, the congregation present is usually a very mixed one, consisting of all ages and temperaments: hence in the re-fashioning of traditional beliefs there is no common basis to build upon. Again, since discussion of sermons *in Church* is unusual, there is always the danger of raising more doubts than one has solved difficulties. And in any case, merely negative criticism, of the type which jubilantly proclaims that we no longer believe a thing, without any prior examination or without stating what is believed, is definitely harmful. One is reminded of a remark made, not altogether justly, by Kingsley on the first appearance of *Essays and Reviews*:

'We have faced doubts in silence, hoping to find a positive solution. Here comes a book which states all the old doubts and difficulties and gives us nothing instead.'

If a preacher disbelieves a doctrine or a statement, but has not studied it sufficiently to make any constructive criticism, then

the pulpit is not the place for him to unload his conscience. Perhaps Laud was to that extent right when he did his best to prevent any public discussion of difficult and abstruse subjects lest truth should become a pretext for dishonouring piety and love. (*Omnem ego semper movi lapidem ne publice scopulosae illae et perplexae quaestiones coram populo tractarentur; ne pietatem et charitatem sub specie veri violaremus.*)

However, the value of pulpit-teaching lies, perhaps, in the opportunities which it opens out for the parson to become a really helpful friend and to prove the constructive value of his faith. The result of pulpit teaching of a Modernist nature may be two-fold. A certain number will find it opposed to things they have been taught and have held dear in the past; they will consequently object—and probably loudly. Others will see new light on topics which have often sorely perplexed them, and will seek and welcome further help. Now to my mind, neither of these results is to be regretted, provided that the person has sufficient sympathy and spiritual insight to deal with them. Consider the first of them. The objectors will probably complain that their faith is being taken from them; and if they are wise they will make their objection to the preacher in person. That will afford him the opportunity of showing that he is not out to attack people's faith but to free it from hindrances and unnecessary accretions which, for many, have hidden the approach to faith itself. Such an examination and exposition can always do good even where it fails to win over the objector. He is made to examine the grounds of his own belief, to search its meaning and to explore its value. If he finds it satisfying, well and good: no Modernist desires to tell a man *what* he *must* believe or must *not* believe, but *how* he *can* believe and live up to the Christian Gospel. And in the case under review, the objector will have been encouraged to find more meaning in his faith, since he has been forced to defend it. As Professor Gilbert Murray says:

'A tradition itself is generally at its best not when it is universally accepted, but when it is being attacked and broken. It is then that it learns to search its own heart and live up to its full meaning' (*Euripides and his Age*).

And the other case, of course, is full of promise. Many people—and especially young people—are only too glad to hear

some of the things which have been serious difficulties before, approached from a new angle. They will welcome discussion and research, and will readily accept the leadership of their pastor in this corporate adventure. Here then is the opportunity for more informal instruction than is possible from the pulpit. Every Teachers' class, and Guild Service, as well as the more definitely educational Tutorial classes, should be less the opportunity for a lecture than for a free and purposive discussion, guided and inspired by the preacher himself. It is in these small round-table talks or open discussions that the idea of a negative creed can be dispelled and Modernism be set forward as a working faith. It alone can offer not an illusory mirage dependent upon incidental conditions which are always liable to change and disappear, but an appreciation of spiritual values which will be a permanent inspiration in life.

But the task of the Modernist includes much more than preaching. His new outlook ought to be a source of inspiration in all the activities of parochial life. He believes that 'Jesus came that we may have life, and may have it abundantly,' and he is ready to interpret life not in any narrow Puritanical sense, but as including all the rich possibilities which modern culture offers. Canon Barnett once used words which every Modernist could take as setting his practical task. Speaking of the priest's work of combatting sin, he explained :

'It is sin in its widest sense against which we are here to fight. *Sin in the sense of missing the best.* Sin must be recognized as manifold, and anything which mars the grandeur of human life must be brought under a converting influence. Such influences are the culture which opens to men's minds the enjoyment of art and literature; the knowledge which makes the whole world alive; the religion which raises men to "the Immanuel's land" whence they see the lives of those who on earth have done the will of their Father in heaven. That all such power may be brought to bear on our people, the organization of the parish has been started.'

To banish 'sin in the sense of missing the best' is a fine practical task for every Modernist. It is his privilege to use his influence on the side of culture, to open to all the door which leads to art, knowledge and literature. These are not extra-religious; they are a part of that fuller life which Jesus came to bring. Hence it is part of the Modernist's task to give a spiritual basis to all

such modern movements by including them within the scope of religion. He must show that the material conditions of life are not opposed to the spiritual, that often the best approach to the latter is by improving the former, and that all such efforts towards material improvement are in themselves spiritual work and stand in need of spiritual inspiration.

Put briefly, this means that the practical task of the parson is to promote the well-being of his parish. And here again the Modernist has an advantage. For him, all Churches have divine sanction in so far as they are doing the divine will; therefore he is concerned less with bringing proselytes to a Church than with making disciples for the Master. Institutions, as such, have no divine sanction; hence they are of secondary importance; they are the means to an end and not the end itself. The Modernist clergyman, of course, as a member of the Established Church, stands quite definitely to uphold its value; but his task in the parish is not primarily to advance the exclusive claims of any Church, but to evoke a renewed faith which will produce a loyal discipleship. He has to work among all classes and creeds, preaching a Gospel and not a system, and content only if the particular system within which he works is wide enough to include his Gospel. On this basis of a new spiritual faith and loyalty, it is obvious that the question of Reunion becomes not only a practical one, but also a pressing one for all Modernists. They can and must work for it, the more because their emphasis on fundamentals and the secondary place which they give to matters of custom and organization provide a more practical approach than the customary one. And would not the greater freedom which the Nonconformists enjoy act as a leavening influence within a united Church?

Someone has said that

‘The reasonable man accommodates himself to the world; only the unreasonable man wants to turn the world upside down to accommodate him and his ideals. Therefore, it is always the unreasonable man who makes for progress.’

But if that is so, it is not always easy to be unreasonable for, paradoxically enough, it requires a greater exercise of reason. It is one thing to know that the world needs turning upside down,

but quite another to possess and use the wisdom and skill necessary to accomplish that task. The need is obvious when we think of the many conventional grooves into which society has comfortably settled—the nightmare of birth and death rates in the slums and the reluctance to sanction any organized teaching of Eugenics; the problem of empty churches and contentment with the inadequate solution of re-dressing religion in fancy clothes instead of thoroughly overhauling the whole thing. In such we seem to have come to what Thomas Hardy once called ‘the plethoric growth of knowledge simultaneously with the starving of wisdom.’ Such a world needs to be turned upside down. But how? How assert that ‘unreasonableness’ which makes for progress?

To turn the world upside down has, perhaps, never been the accomplishment of the Christian Church in any age, though probably it can claim a greater measure of success than any of its rivals. Not that the world would *necessarily* be the better for being thus served, though much depends on whether it were turned or churned. But such has ever been the problem which the Church has had to face. It is not exclusively the problem of the Modernist, for all disciples of Christ have as their task so to transform the world that it may become increasingly the sphere for the realization of the Kingdom of God and of His Christ. But for the Modernist the matter has a special significance, since much that he sees to be in need of overturning has already been long reserved by others as their resting place. Consequently, he will need moral courage and wisdom if he is to secure progress.

IS THERE BALM IN GILEAD?

By CANON TOLLINTON, D.D., D.Litt., Rector of Tendring.

IN accordance with a resolution of the Church Assembly, dated July 6th, 1928, the Archbishops appointed a Committee to consider the Reports of the Conference on Faith and Order, which had been held at Lausanne in the previous year. The Committee was adequately representative of the different schools of thought in the Church of England; its chairman was the Bishop of Gloucester, and its membership included Bishop Gore, Bishop Palmer, Dean Bate, Dr. Bell and Canon Garfield Williams, the two latter retiring on their respective appointments to the Bishopric of Chichester and the Deanery of Llandaff. The Committee also had interviews with Archbishop Germanos, with the Secretary of the International Missionary Council, with representatives of the Free Churches and with other persons known to be interested in the question of Reunion. The Report¹ of this Committee was issued in February last. It is a document deserving consideration, the more so that it has definitely been prepared with the approaching Lambeth Conference in view.

It cannot be claimed that this Report carries us very far towards a settlement of the questions that have become prominent since the 'Appeal to all Christian people' was sent out from Lambeth ten years ago. The Report does not conclude with any series of definite recommendations. Its positive suggestions are few and somewhat obvious. Five Notes and fourteen Memoranda are contributed by certain of its signatories, and add a large element of qualification. The *Times*² was quite fair in describing the Report as providing 'a statement of problems rather than their solution,' and indeed it might be said that this is what the Committee was appointed to do. But in any case we

¹ *Report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider the findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order pursuant to Resolution of the Church Assembly passed at the Summer Sessions, 1928, together with various Memoranda.* The Publication Board of the Church Assembly. February, 1930. 3/-.

² Leading Article, March 24th.

have here a useful presentation of the main aspects of the problem of Reunion as once again, after ten years of discussion, our Fathers in God will return to its consideration.

On the whole, in regard to this particular issue, the results of the last decade have been disappointing. Ten years ago the Lambeth Appeal gave the Christian world a vision of unity and a hope of fellowship renewed. There was something of glamour and elevation in the proposals. The 'Quadrilateral' did not seem impossible as a basis. Memories of the Great War gave an additional value to what was a genuine expression of goodwill. If the Appeal was somewhat Anglican in tone, that was natural enough in an utterance coming from the Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

There followed, as we know, discussions with the Free Churches, Conversations at Malines, then the Lausanne Conference in 1927. Sincerity and goodwill have characterized all these meetings. Theological bitterness has been notably absent. But the main result in each case has been the recognition and formulation of difficulties rather than advance towards unity. The one positive element in the present situation is the South Indian Scheme, and that is sufficiently important. For the rest, the Report makes it clear that while there is general agreement as to the Message of Christianity, on other points, notably on the Nature of the Church, on the Ministry and especially on the Historic Episcopate, further study and enquiry are at present the only avenues open towards agreement. Unfortunately study and enquiry by no means invariably result in unanimity. Further, it is notable that in regard to the South Indian Scheme the Report is content to give two Memoranda, one by Bishop Palmer, the other by Bishop Gore, which express different and apparently irreconcilable points of view. That 'God wills unity' is common ground, but on none of the main debated issues is the way to it yet made plain. The matter for thankfulness is that we really have begun to be unhappy about our divisions, and that on each side we recognize that our opponents are as sincerely convinced as we ourselves.

The urgency of the South Indian question is not without advantage. The concrete particular instance brings the issue home. Abstract principles come into the domain of actuality

and decision, one way or another, must be made. On the other hand, hard cases make bad law, and a solution devised to fit particular circumstances may not always work well when it becomes a precedent and goes to form a universal rule. At home advances towards Reunion can in any case not be rapid. In South India delay may bring the whole project to disaster. The task of the Bishops at Lambeth will be complicated by the fact that they must deal alike with an immediate issue and with an ideal which it would be only foolish to attempt to realize at once. In the light of this Report it may be of interest to consider some of the alternatives which seem likely to present themselves at Lambeth.

Feeling in favour of the South Indian Scheme is unquestionably strong. The proposals have been carefully prepared. The modifications suggested by the General Council of the Church of India, Burmah and Ceylon do not touch their essential features. The scheme meets an urgent spiritual demand. Friends of Reunion would feel its rejection at Lambeth disastrous.

And yet it is strongly opposed. Those whose views are represented by Bishop Gore and Professor N. P. Williams³ regard the suggested initial arrangements as surrendering Catholic principle in regard to Episcopacy. Therefore, as the scheme stands, they would wish it declined. Their views may be erroneous and incapable of justification on grounds of history. The point is that this adverse estimate has been definitely formed by a section of the English Church which cannot be described as negligible. Probably most Modernists (among whom the present writer would wish to be included) support the South Indian Scheme, but, even so, it is only foolish to ignore the fact that the prospects of its receiving unanimous support at Lambeth are minute indeed, and that to purchase union in South India at the cost of increased cleavage or disruption at home would, when the accounts are balanced, mean not gain but loss. The disastrous outcome of our efforts to amend the Prayer Book, due neither to Parliament, nor to the Bishops, but to the divisions within the Church of England, is too recent for its warnings to be ignored. Supposing approval at Lambeth is found impos-

³ See *Lausanne, Lambeth and South India*. Longman, Green and Co. 2/6.

sible except by something like a majority vote, what alternatives, this being regarded as undesirable, would remain?

Lord Hugh Cecil⁴ has urged that there shall be no pronouncement by Lambeth, either favourable or unfavourable, but that the South Indian Christians should be left to organize the new Church for themselves, without formal approval or disapproval on the part of the Church at home. To some extent that might save the situation in India, though many resulting questions would remain unsolved. But it would be a lamentable confession of incompetence on the part of the Church of England were the only possible answer on a crucial issue to be, 'We are so divided that we cannot offer any definite advice.' The Lambeth Conference may not possess any regulative authority, but at least the Anglican Communion has come to look for wise counsel from its meetings. The credit of such an assembly would be not a little impaired, were it silent through division on an important question of the day.

Another solution has been ruled out, perhaps regrettably so, by the proposers of the South Indian Scheme themselves. Bishop Palmer writes :

'Corporate union alone is desired or aimed at. Federation has been definitely set aside, and so also has the method of dealing with the interim period by restricting every minister to the performance of worship according to the Rite of the Church in which he received his ordination.'⁵

Those who are in contact with the conditions can alone judge on such a point, but in so difficult a question it seems matter for regret that any possible solution should be rejected beforehand. An interim arrangement, declared and accepted as provisional, securing Episcopacy as the eventual basis but avoiding the issue raised by Section 3 (c)⁶ of the published Scheme, might have been possible. Failing any preferable solution, it may be worth asking whether these rejected alternatives do not deserve further consideration.

⁴ See his letter in the *Guardian* of January 10th.

⁵ *Report*, p. 77.

⁶ This section provides 'that all the other (*i.e.* other than Bishops) ministers of the uniting Churches in the area of the Union shall be acknowledged as Ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the United Church, each retaining the standing (whether as a minister authorised to celebrate the Holy Communion or as a deacon or a probationer) which he had before union in his own Church.'

It will of course also be possible for Lambeth to refer the Scheme back to its Committee for modification, with an indication of the points on which the Church at home deems amendment desirable. That would probably involve ten years' delay and to hang up decision for so long might have serious consequences. Plainly, too, it is doubtful whether the Wesleyans and the South India United Church could be brought to accept such a measure of alteration as would meet the objections raised in the Church at home from the Catholic point of view. Bishop Palmer has described the Scheme as 'a hazardous attempt to bring about Christ's will.' No one can say what will happen in the next ten years, but their possibilities at least include the entire loss of the great opportunity now available, should time pass and the opportunity remain unused. We have no guarantee that the spirit which to-day might bring this venture to high success will be equally strong in 1940. It may be a case of now or not at all. 'Already the Mission Field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church.'⁸

It may be that, under the difficult conditions which prevail, the policy of Lord Hugh Cecil is the least open to objection. It would be an unsatisfactory solution, but not the worst.

The interest of the South Indian Scheme, with its urgency, its attractive possibilities and its strong reactions upon the internal situation in the Church at home, will probably secure for it the first place in the attention of the Bishops when they meet in Lambeth. But we may hope that the particular case will not obscure the wider aspects of Reunion and that the possibilities of the situation, as it has changed since 1920, will be carefully considered. These possibilities are indeed more restricted, the goal of unity vastly more remote, than they appeared to be when the last Conference issued its confident invitation. The Report we are considering speaks of the remarkable agreement between the reports of the Lausanne Conference and the Lambeth Appeal.⁹ Let every possible item of hope and of encouragement be gathered from such agreement by the optimists of the cause. It remains true not the less that indeed 'much remains to be done' before corporate unity can be realized on any large scale, that the desire for it has not yet permeated the

⁷ *Report*, p. 99.

⁸ *Lausanne Reports*, No. 1.

⁹ P. 10.

rank and file of the Churches at home, that the re-ordination of ministers of the non-episcopal Churches, suggested at Lambeth, has been finally declined, that the Baptist Union regards the evangelical and the sacerdotal types of Church as irreconcilably divergent,¹⁰ and that even so true a friend of the great cause as Dr. Garvie admits that he has 'not yet got even a glimpse of the synthesis in which the Catholic thesis and the Protestant antithesis can be harmonized.'¹¹ This Report on the Lausanne Conference advises with notable iteration further study and enquiry on all the main debated issues. So did the representatives of the Church of England and of the Free Churches suspend the activities of their Conferences that there might be opportunity for further 'study and understanding.'¹² Wise counsel, no doubt, especially if we may still regard the Church of England as devoted to 'sound learning.' But reconciliation through enquiry is a slow process. Christendom has argued over its central Rite for centuries, and the argument goes on still. As an ideal Reunion is even more evidently desirable than it was in 1920. As a practical policy its possibilities are unquestionably more remote. The facts of the situation seem to allow Lambeth little opportunity to make further concrete proposals for organic Reunion.

Federation has never been a popular proposal in the Church of England. It is commonly characterized as 'mere' and 'vague,' and Bishops have been known to regard occasions when it has failed to receive approval as among the mercies of God. It has been called 'dangerous,' a patchwork garment in place of the seamless robe, suspected in the Mission Field, easily arranged and as easily dissolved, a poor second-best, perhaps possible but, if so, hardly worth while.

All this may be true enough if Federation be regarded as an alternative to Reunion. But it is not necessarily an alternative. It may be a stage. The Report No. VII of the Lausanne Conference records the opinion of some who believe such a form of co-operation to be of value and notes that Federation may be

¹⁰ *Report*, p. 50.

¹¹ Article in the *Contemporary Review*, April, 1930, p. 476.

¹² *The Church of England and the Free Churches. Proceedings of Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, 1921—1925.* p. 65.

regarded as a 'step on the road to organic union.' The subject is included as one deserving consideration in the list of 'Questions for Reunionists' issued by the Committee of the World Conference and quoted in the March number of *The Modern Churchman*.¹³ A proposal has been recently made at an Evangelical Conference¹⁴—not, we hope, representative of the Evangelical School as a whole—to turn out the Anglo-Catholics and so make room for the Wesleyans in the Church of England. Such are the exigencies to which any policy of immediate Reunion may compel us. The great advantage of Federation is that it involves no such drastic rearrangement. Within the circle of the federated societies each would for the time being retain its own ministry, its own tradition, its own denominational assets. The whole question of 'denying the validity of our orders' would not arise. The basis of membership would not be wholly ecclesiastical; sacramental and doctrinal variety would remain. The aim of such a form of association would rather be that of 'consolidating all those who profess the Name of Christ'—the phrase is Bishop Gore's. In such a Federation all would be members of the Church in so far as this is guaranteed by Baptism, whatever denominational differentiation might have supervened upon this common sacramental condition. At present Reunion would carry us too far. The objection to Federation is that it does not carry us far enough. This is admitted, but the question is whether at the present time any further measure of advance is possible. At least a scheme of federated Churches would be a beginning. Greater interdenominational co-operation, in fields where this is amply possible, would tend to diminish the mentality of separation and help to create the right atmosphere in which, without haste or pressure, admitted outstanding difficulties could be considered and brought in God's time, near or remote, to their eventual solution. If it is true that 'God wills unity,' it seems also true that, in the realm of Grace as in that of Nature, God also wills diversity. It is not impossible that a Federation of Societies of the Name might provide the right environment for the gathering of our retained diversities into a higher unity. Lambeth in 1920 rejected the

¹³ Pp. 684-5.

¹⁴ See the account in the *Times* of April 8th.

idea of Federation. In 1930 the situation is so different that we hope this method of approach to Reunion will not be passed by without consideration.

It is to be admitted that Federation is open to two among other objections. When it is called 'vague' and 'mere' the implication is that its items of common action would not be numerous or important, that its ties of association would be weak, that denominational interests would outweigh the interests of the Federation as a whole, that in nominal unity we should hide rather than remedy prevailing separation. The risk of such an unsatisfactory outcome is plain enough, though indeed Churches which could only be united in such a distant and meagre relationship would hardly find it worth while to entertain the idea. All would depend on the real desire for unity. This is the essential condition as much of Reunion as of Federation. Without it even Reunion might remain largely nominal. The Stockholm Conference gave prominence to the idea of a *Communio in serviendo oeconomica*. Even Lambeth advised 'Councils representing all Christian Communions.' The ground and material for co-operation is sufficiently abundant, if the spirit wills. Even further enquiry into the Nature of the Church or in regard to the Historic Episcopate should be more possible when diversity of opinion had already been gathered into some sort of outward and recognizable unity in the Name of the common Christ. A Federation that achieved nothing of value would probably fail through the indifference of its members rather than through any inherent weakness in its scheme.

The other difficulty arises over the question of inter-communion. Under Federation the interchange of pulpits and united services for special occasions could be arranged without difficulty. But, justifiably or not, the common participation of Anglicans and non-Anglicans in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, even on special occasions, arouses difference of opinion. As the Report makes plain, there is much diversity of view as to whether a united Communion Service should signalize the completion of a scheme of union or whether, under due restriction, it should be admissible in earlier stages of the process.

Now the Confirmation rule is plain enough. Its value for the Church's own members is generally admitted. No question in

regard to it is here intended, as it is operative within our Church. But is no exercise of spiritual hospitality admissible in this connection? Are we really wise and right in maintaining towards those who, like ourselves, are within the Church by Baptism the invariable attitude of 'Procul este, profani,' which was characteristic of the pagan mysteries? The member of a family shares the common meal of the household on quite a different footing from that of the invited guest. The guest comes by hospitality, not by right of membership. Might it not be so in regard to the Supper of the Lord, so that, under Federation, the members of the different households of faith should, on occasion and under whatever regulation and restriction seemed expedient, still share in one another's Communion on the footing of hospitality, as visitors for some particular occasion made welcome and entertained? In individual cases something of this kind is contemplated in the Report.¹⁵ Bishop Creighton,¹⁶ too, is recorded to have held that the Confirmation Rubric might be interpreted historically, as not contemplating the case of Non-conformists. Much that is said in Appendix 12 of this Report on Economic Intercommunion between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches might admit of a more general application. Few of us to-day would regard such an act as Dean Stanley's invitation to the Revisers of the New Testament to attend a Celebration in Westminster Abbey as a 'horrible sacrilege' or as 'a giving of what was most holy to the dogs.'¹⁷ Would such occasional fellowship at the Table of the Lord, based on a hospitality which implied that differences were not veiled but recognized, violate any established principle of Christian order? And, if not, under Federation it would become a matter for discretion and wise regulation by competent authority. So perhaps might we come as near as modern conditions allow to Augustine's principle, *Salvo jure communionis diversa sentire*.¹⁸

¹⁵ P. 30, the last paragraph.

¹⁶ *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 63.

¹⁷ *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 216-7.

¹⁸ Providing validity be preserved, views may vary.—ED., M.C.

AN APPEAL TO MODERN CHURCHMEN

BY THE EDITOR.

WE venture to make an appeal to Modernist and Liberal Churchmen on behalf of Modernist candidates for Holy Orders. As Modernists we recognize that the signal failure of many of the parochial clergy in their teaching to realize the significance of modern research and modern thought for Christian faith, tends to sap the supply of desirable ordinands in the parishes. What, it seems to us, many Modernists fail to recognize is that if Modernist Englishmen are to have an adequate Modernist ministry, it is essential to give financial help to Modernist Theological Colleges and to Modernist ordinands. It is for these Modernist ordinands we wish to appeal. Modernists may not be aware that thousands of pounds are given annually by both Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals of the narrower kind towards the training of ordinands in their seminaries. For instance, the Anglo-Catholic Ordination Candidates Fund for 1926-29 received £23,614, and this provided for the ordination of 258 men. From this fund seven Anglo-Catholic Theological Colleges received block grants ranging from £133 to £550.

Now there are a number of potential Modernist ordinands who, especially after the expense of graduation, are too poor to pay for the theological training required for Ordination, and as a consequence they are compelled to take up other work.

Moreover, there are many open-minded young men who would gladly go to a Modernist Theological College, but who do not do so, because the Modernist Theological College can offer them no financial assistance, whereas other organizations readily come forward with it. As a consequence of this these young men do not enter the ministry with open minds, but with minds which are closed or warped. There is no need to dwell on the results, for the Modernist practising laity experience and bewail them weekly.

Where appeals have been made to Modernists in the name of philanthropy and charity, we have ever found them most generous, but appeals on behalf of the ministry of the Church

they seem to ignore. They do not seem to recognize the urgency of the need.

We, at Ripon Hall for years past, have worked steadily for the Modernist cause in the way of trying to train a Modernist or Liberal ministry. We have had various difficulties to contend with—not least a great deal of secret, and some of it very influential, opposition. We do not complain of this.

We must expect opposition from those who do not share our ideals. When a Bishop says to a young man, 'I have nothing against you except your connection with Ripon Hall,' that does not surprise us, if the Bishop in question reads the *Church Times* regularly and knows nothing at all personally of Ripon Hall and its staff. On the other hand, while we expect opposition from opponents, we do feel that we ought to be able to look for support to those who believe in our cause. It is humiliating that while Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals can help, with thousands of pounds, ordinands to train in their seminaries, Modernists have only the most meagre resources on which to draw, and that because the Modernist laity, with certain rare and gratifying exceptions, *gives nothing to this object*.

The usefulness of Ripon Hall would be helped greatly, if we could receive £500 a year regularly for that purpose. Spread over the membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union that would not be a large sum: spread over the readers of the *Modern Churchman*, it would be a very small one.

May we then venture to appeal to Modernists to help us generously by undertaking to give an annual subscription to the Ripon Hall Exhibition Fund? We shall be glad to receive and acknowledge subscriptions sent to us personally.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE THEORY OF CHRIST'S ETHICS*

Under this title Dr. Spencer writes a sequel to his two earlier books, returning here to a 'theoretical discussion of our Lord's ethics, and topics connected with them.' He begins this later book with a short discussion of the ethics of the Old Testament, and of later pre-Christian Jewish literature in the book of Tobit and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. The objection that the ethic of Christ was only intended for an interim period before the approaching end is then stated, with a long quotation

* *The Theory of Christ's Ethics*. By F. A. M. Spencer, D.D. (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1929. pp. 252. 10/6.)

from Dr. Weiss; Dr. Spencer dismisses Dr. Weiss' view as 'unsympathetic, not to say patronising,' and himself concludes: 'All this constitutes one of the gravest problems of New Testament exegesis, far too complicated to be discussed here. But I submit that His eschatology, whatever it exactly was, did not in His mind invalidate His ethic, just as it evidently did not invalidate His belief in the ransom of mankind from evil by His death.' The lack of explicit social implications in the ethic of the Gospel is noticed, and supplemented by an appeal to the prophets; possibly here it would have been better to have accepted the emphasis of Jesus on a Kingdom not of this world, and on a change of heart which is more important than, and must in any case precede, a change of environment, and to have asked whether it is not we who in recent years have over-emphasized the Kingdom as a social Utopia. In a chapter on the moralizing of instincts, Dr. Spencer suggests that 'we may gather from psychology much counsel as to how to deal with refractory impulses and besetting sins'; and he proceeds to give a brief but clear analysis of the contribution of modern psychological theory and terminology to his subject. Two very good chapters treat of 'Character and Virtues,' and of 'Sin and Sins'; of faith it is well said, 'The Christian life is or should be characterized by amazing energy and effectiveness, the wielding of mighty force derived by faith from the creative Spirit of God'; of penitence it is well said, 'For the transcendently important and difficult tasks of His Kingdom God requires thoroughly repentant—that is, self-consecrated—workers.'

A late chapter on 'The Pharisaic Complex' takes up again a theme partly treated under the earlier heading of 'Christ's Attitude to the Law.' There is some good description of the defects of Pharisaism. 'The trouble with the religious leaders—the most eager and conscientious of them, the Pharisees—was rather that they were imbued with an egoism which perverted their best thoughts and efforts, and was extremely difficult to eradicate, being fenced about with an elaborate system of make-believe.' Dr. Spencer is inclined to reject the harsher criticism of the Pharisees; he suggests that 'the gentle sarcasm, said perhaps with a kindly smile, if indeed it was sarcasm at all, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners,"' may mean that Jesus recognized that 'they had a certain rectitude and virtue.' It may be suggested that his treatment of this theme does not quite do justice to the conflict of the Gospel and the Law, and to the preference for sinners in the Kingdom. The Good News of the Love and Forgiveness of God is heard only by those who have realised that even their best is all unworthy; hence it is that the sinners enter the Kingdom first, and that the self-righteous only enter when they cease to imagine themselves as self-justified by their own petty piety. Certainly without Pharisaism there would have been no St. Paul; but St. Paul, a Pharisee of the Pharisees, learnt to recognize himself as chief of sinners, before he understood and accepted the graciousness of God in Christ.

But is the ethic of Christ the real message of Christ? Dr. Spencer follows Dean Rashdall in distinguishing Principles and Precepts; granted this distinction, even so did Jesus chiefly intend to emphasize or expand or supplement principles which were after all found, as Jewish commentators are not slow to point out, in pre-Christian Judaism? Does not St. Paul bring us nearer alike to the real problem of life, and to the Christian solution, when he says that the clearer knowledge of what ought to be done only serves to bring into clearer light the fact of sin, our inability to do the good that we would? Have we perhaps in recent Christianity, through

stressing the humanitarian ethic of the Sermon on the Mount, neglected the real message of the Gospel, that men should repent, and wait and watch and pray, until the Kingdom of God come with power from on high?

There is throughout this book an undertone, becoming rather more dominant in a concluding chapter on 'The Moral and the Spiritual,' suggesting that a theory of Christ's ethic is insufficient as a statement of Christ's work. 'The comparative failure of His mission as a Teacher seems to have made Him realize more vividly His mission as a Redeemer. It is as if the Cross were needed to give effect to the Sermon on the Mount.' 'How came it that St. Paul saw in Christ crucified his only hope of salvation? . . . Though the sacrifice of Christ could not make God more eager to forgive, yet it made men more able to repent.' Our Lord 'believed, or came to believe, that after His sacrificial death He would be a great spiritual Personality, spiritually quickening those who gave themselves to Him, and thereby inspiring them with a heroic devotion to the Divine purposes and a penetrating sympathy for others.' These sentences, taken from different parts of the book, point to an underlying theme which is other than that of a theory of ethics. They suggest that perhaps the work of Christ was not to give men a theory of ethics, but rather to give them the necessary power to live as at their best they knew they should; not to offer ethical principles as a law, alien to men's nature, but rather so to reform men's nature that the ethic would then become with them, as with Christ Himself, the description of a natural, spontaneous way of life. This redeeming work of Christ supremely needs restudy and re-statement; when Dr. Spencer asks, 'May it not be worth while to attempt to express the Atonement in psychological terms?' the answer is less certain. If attention is focussed on this theme underlying the ethics, then it may appear that before a man can become all in all loyal to the reign of God, he must realize the impossibility of self-justification by his own labour; and that for this end the sharp knife of all Christ's criticism of Pharisaism, even of Pharisaism at its best, was fully justifiable and necessary. More positively it may appear that men must realize that it is God's world in which they live and not their own; that they must turn and wait on Him till He reveal His purpose to them, and this not in general principles, but in the concrete instant of decision; and that they must then seek His aid till they can say, like Jesus, that it is their very meat and drink to work His will. Dr. Spencer writes that 'it is surely in agreement with the general tenor of the Christ's teaching that we should seek to understand God's dealings with men on the analogy of the dealings of parents with their children, rather than on the analogy of those of kings with their subjects.' We may perhaps wonder whether here too we are not too apt to make the message of Christ conform to our easy humanitarianism, instead of being willing to listen to the more exacting note of His original teaching. Certainly He looks to God as Father; but when He turns to the claim of God on man, He has very much more to say of a Kingdom than of a family.

GEOFFREY ALLEN.

A COLLECTION OF LATIN HYMNS.*

Twenty-four Hymns of the Western Church is a delightfully printed volume. It contains the Latin text, with a verse-rendering of each hymn, a brief introduction, commentary, and appendices. Mr. Blakeney is not

* *Hymns of the Western Church*. Edited by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (Published by Eric Partridge, 30 Museum Street, London: 1930. Price 16/-.)

limited as was Archbishop Trench in his *Sacred Latin Poetry*. Mr. Trench, as he then (1849) was, only selected such Latin hymns as an English Churchman could use for purposes of religious devotion. This compelled him to exclude such magnificent compositions as the *Pange, lingua, gloriosi corporis mysterium* of St. Thomas Aquinas as it teaches Transubstantiation, as also the *Stabat mater dolorosa* since it encourages Mariolatry. Mr. Blakeney has made use of no doctrinal or devotional test. His sole test is literary merit. As a consequence Abelard's *O quanta qualia* and the magnificent *Salve, caput cruentatum* of his theological persecutor, St. Bernard, repose together in close proximity in Mr. Blakeney's select collection, like the entombed bodies of Fox and Pitt in Westminster Abbey. By a similar necessity, the anonymous *Veni, Creator Spiritus*, the only Latin hymn in our Prayer-Book, and selections from the *De contemptu mundi* of Bernard of Morval (not Morlaix, as we formerly supposed) composed in dactylic rimed hexameters—we have also heard the metre described as triplex crested leonines—are also included.

There is only one hymn in the collection we are sorry to see there. It is *Veni, Redemptor gentium*. Its amazing concreteness, objectivity and materialism, which in some measure characterize mediaeval Latin hymnology as a whole, are not, so it seems to us, redeemed by any outstanding virtues. Such phrases as '*non ex virili semine, alvus tumescit Virginis*,' cannot be rendered into English, and certainly have no devotional value. In its place we should have liked to have had *De profundis exclamantes* with Dr. Littledale's translation. It expresses with almost invincible emotion the spirit which prompts Masses for the departed.

As we study collections of mediaeval Latin hymns, it is impossible not to feel what enrichment in range and spirituality our English hymnology has gained from such writers as the two Wesleys, Heber, Hosmer, Keble, Ellerton, Lowell, Wittier and Lyte.

Of the twenty-four translations, twelve are by John Mason Neale. They are well known to users of our English hymnals, and probably could not be bettered. Although Richard Crashaw ranks high among our minor poets, we can only regard his translation of the *Dies irae* as a literary curiosity. The translation by W. J. Irons in the *English Hymnal* seems to us much superior. Mr. St. John Thackeray's translation of *Deus ignee fons animarum* is one of the very best in Mr. Blakeney's selection. Mr. Blakeney's own translation of the hymn *Verbum Dei, Deo natum* (celebrating St. John the Divine) is well worthy of its place. The first stanza runs thus :—

' Word of God, of God begotten,
Which (not fashioned nor created)
From the heaven of heavens descended ;
This the loved disciple witnessed :
This with mortal fingers handled,
This to all mankind revealing.
There amid immortal rivers
Springing from the wells of glory,
John the apostle stood, and proffered
Draughts of living water, bringing
To our sin-struck world salvation.'

We like his *Invocation* even better since it is, being an original composition and not a translation, much more his own.

Mr. Blakeney's introduction and notes are scholarly and abound with

interesting and accurate information. In Appendix I the *Te Deum*, we regret to note, is not printed in accordance with the results of our best modern scholarship. The *Te Deum* proper ends with *munerari*. What follows it are versicles, and should be printed separately.

H.D.A.M.

A JAPANESE EVANGELIST.*

There are not many writers whose first book runs through 180 editions, but that distinction belongs to Toyohiko Kagawa, who has inspired and captivated his people as few modern prophets have done. In many respects he is the Gandhi of Japan—though the likeness is along the lines of selfless devotion and magnetic personality rather than of political propaganda. Kagawa has spent most of his life with Japanese slum-dwellers, not only working with them but living among them. His whole life has been spent in the attempt to give the Christian Gospel of Love a working chance. That has been behind his work in fostering Labour movements and Farmers' Unions, and if it has meant persecution and imprisonment for him, he has never wavered in his full-hearted belief in the omnipotence of Love as the supreme power in life. He has been a prolific writer both of novels and of technical works. The present volume was written in 1924, and is really an exposition of his philosophy of Love. It is evident from it that he has read very widely and that he brings a vivid imagination to the aid of his study. Hence he illustrates his points from a wide circumference—now from the physiological habits of the ant world, now from the 'Ptolemaic economics' of the Capitalists (p. 171). Perhaps this very agility makes his work more difficult for the Western reader. Kagawa concerns himself with the whole of life, and he wanders up and down over its keyboard extemporizing. There is nothing systematic, but the central theme continually reveals itself. He achieves many beautiful *nuances*, and then his foot stays on the pedal waiting, as it were, for some fresh inspiration.

But it is time that Western readers knew more of the prolific work which Kagawa has accomplished; and this book gives an insight into his philosophy and also provides an excellent short biography of a noble and notable man.

J.P.H.

THE BIBLE AND MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

The current number of *The Bible and Modern Religious Thought** contains some excellent articles. Professor Paul Volz writes on the relation of the Religions of the Ancient East to Biblical Religion. Professor Oesterley has a most interesting article on 'The Jewish Education of the Child.' Philo writes: 'Children must be taught religion in their very swaddling clothes.' It was generally accepted that the child must begin to learn the Scriptures at five. Jewish teaching was fundamentally religious; it was oral; it attached great importance to frequent repetition; and it was kind in its methods. One Rabbi is said to have distributed sweetmeats as an incentive to the younger children. Although girls were not educated as well as boys, yet they did receive education, and in some cases women taught in the schools and even preached in the synagogues.

Professor Howard writes on 'Early Christian Thought.' There were two tests by which the Primitive Christian was differentiated from the Jew. (1) He claimed Jesus as the Messiah. (2) He possessed the gifts of

* *Love, the Law of Life*. By Toyohiko Kagawa. (S.C.M., 1930. Price 7/6.)

* Published by G. Neal, 12 Patten Road, London, S.W.18. (Price 1/1, post free.)

the Spirit. Professor Garvie concludes the number with an article on 'Knowledge and Vision,' a very helpful contribution for plain people who, as the result of listening to the higher critics, do not know where they are or ought to be.

H.D.A.M.

MEDIATING MODERNISM.*

The chapters of this book are the Bolen Lectures for 1928. To the author, while yet a law student, through the influence of the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, religion became a profoundly personal matter. Its form was evangelical, of the Calvinist type. Further study had the now familiar effect of gradually developing the theological student and later Professor of Church History, into a Broad or Liberal Churchman. Beginning with a firm belief in the truth of the essentials of Christianity and experience of their power, he attempted their expression in a form acceptable to his reason. This development was assisted by the later accepted duties of a parish priest and the consequent efforts to commend the message to the hearts and minds of his parishioners. Indeed, this book is chiefly remarkable as the work of one who has been engrossed for years in the task of Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia—in the country where 'efficiency' as a cult ranks higher than in England. It might be supposed to be impossible that a parochial clergyman could, in such circumstances, find time for the study and thought which have gone to the making of this book. The English parish priest who reads it will be greatly impressed by the author's acquaintance with modern philosophical literature. The style of the book is clear and concise, and also free from the 'breeziness' and other characteristics which, to English minds, frequently convey the impression of superficiality in American books. Dr. Grammer's lectures are positive and constructive, and are not, as his title might suggest, a dreary catalogue of 'how much has to go and how much we may still believe.' The sanity of his ideal is expressed in the following words:

'Around these two foci, Christianity and Reason, all my thought and teaching have revolved, and I have reached definite conclusions. One is that it is the wise course to begin with the acceptance of the traditions and the standards bequeathed to us by the past, as a provisional guide of life. The radical who proposes to begin his search for truth by denying everything until it has been proved, is like a scholar who should require a demonstration of the beauty of literature before reading the poets. If science is justified in its fundamental assumption that the universe is comprehensible by reason, surely theology is equally justified in its assumption that religion, which has such an important function in the life of the most rational part of nature that we know of, must have a rational basis' (p. 24).

Dr. Grammer deals in fundamentals. After the introductory and partly biographical lecture, there are seven others on Man, The Existence of God, The Personality of God, Inspiration, Providence, Miracles and Mysticism. The freshness of presentation awakens and retains the reader's interest. The critical reader will perhaps complain that Dr. Grammer's optimistic faith does not predispose him to take the full measure of certain problems inherent in his themes, and that his digestion of the quoted literature is incomplete. But the book should be judged as what it is, not as what it is not. Its character is largely that of a *confessio fidei*, together with the

* *Things that Remain.* By Carl E. Grammer, S.T.D. (The Macmillan Company, New York: 1929. Price \$1.75.)

reasons, intellectual, emotional, practical, which confirm him in his faith : it is not a systematic examination and rejection of positions which others may regard as equally or more legitimate. Some readers may wonder how Dr. Grammer can write that 'God has been the conclusion of every kind of philosophy (except Positivism, which is the denial of the validity of philosophy),' and will think this statement is only true in a sense so broad as to approach the meaningless. Not a little philosophy is really incompatible with Theism or with historical Christian theology, and so much is implied in Dr. Grammer's rejection of the philosophy of Immanence which finds no place for Transcendence, and by his rejection of the identity of God and the Absolute.

In certain passages of this book, where criticism is aroused, the reasoning will hardly secure conviction. Dr. Grammer says that 'faith in our Father's leading, confidence that our Father will not allow us to be tempted beyond what we are able to bear, loyalty in defeat, humility in prosperity, reliance on the Father's care' are 'the spiritual values that are connected with a belief in Providence.' That these values may be retained 'without any belief in a God who will interfere with the course of nature in behalf of His people, or in answer to our prayers,' he dismisses as 'mere assertion,' and adds : 'Practical experience shows that when people accept that view of the relation of God to the universe, they stop praying' (p. 158). Now practical experience does *not* show this : it merely shows it to be true of some people, while it equally shows it to be not true of others. And even the theology which holds that view of Providence has, at its best, emphasized that prayer of which it is the motive is the lowest form of prayer. Dr. Grammer is peculiarly unhappy in the way in which he cites Jesus in support of his view of the nature and operation of Providence :

'When tempted to take a short-cut to preserve His life and prove His Messiahship, He relied on the Divine Provision. He was confident that the universe is so run that those who seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness are blessed. Our Heavenly Father knoweth of our bodily needs, and can and will provide for them as He cares for the plants and animals' (p. 159).

Now Dr. Grammer can extract from that a confirmation of his view that Providence implies 'belief in a God who will interfere with the course of nature,' is hard to understand. It would appear to be precisely this view of Providence which, in the Temptation, Jesus rejected. Dr. Grammer returns to the same question in his chapter on Miracles. (It appears, incidentally, that in America there are 'conservative Modernists' who extol the Sermon on the Mount and ignore Jesus' healings and the Resurrection appearances.) The discussion of Miracles is shrouded in vagueness owing to the absence of any definition of miracle or 'the miraculous.' Without such definition, Dr. Grammer's excellent advice that 'the safest plan is to consider the evidence' does not greatly help, as indeed his own illustrations show. He says that if ants possess the generalizing faculty, 'we may be sure that their systematizers scoff at the report of human interferences with ant-activities' (p. 185). But should the ants investigate the report, and as a result become convinced of its truth, would they regard the human interferences as 'miraculous,' or decide that 'nature' contained possibilities thereto unsuspected by ant-knowledge? The religious and philosophical problem of miracles is not that of their *à priori* possibility, nor even whether certain alleged events have actually occurred, but rather, supposing their actual reality to be established, *how they can be known to be* 'miraculous'? If there are people who find support for religious faith in belief in

an undefined 'miraculous' together with a marked disinclination to commit themselves to belief in the actual occurrence of alleged specific miracles, or to assign such events to 'the miraculous,' perhaps only the malicious would wish to deprive them of such support. But the position is not one which theologians can permanently adopt without discredit to theology.

These criticisms do not imply that this book is not well worth reading. Its spirit reveals that its author does not wish it to be read uncritically or to be uncritically quoted as a Modernist 'authority.' It contains much careful thought and shrewd observation, and many wise sayings. When more parochial clergymen are capable of thinking of their religion in Dr. Grammer's way, the Church will achieve greater influence among reflective people.

J. S. BEZZANT.

IN THE BODY PENT?

We remember a certain University Sermon in which the preacher startled some of his audience by the assertion that 'we no longer believe that man has got a soul.' He proceeded to explain that man is a living soul and not a body giving habitation to some ephemeral substance called soul. But such dualism is very popular; and even where it would be repudiated, there is often much vagueness and confusion as to the function of soul and body.

Dr. Townley Lord's book* is an attempt to clear away some of this confusion and to approach the problem of personality from the standpoint of the value of the body. Beginning with a survey of O.T. teaching, he shows that Hebrew thought did not oppose body and soul in an ethical dualism, but through the conception of the 'breath-soul' in man (*ruach*) came to value the body as the means of divine activity. Thus it regarded man's nature as essentially spiritual; the frailty of flesh might be an excuse for imperfection, but it was not essentially evil. This estimation of the body was accepted in the New Testament and carried on into Christian tradition. Ideas alien to the thought of the O.T. — such as the theory of pre-existence and the disparagement of the body — had already appeared before the first century and were fostered as Platonism and Neo-Platonism influenced the thought of the Church, and the writer traces the conflict of views through the long ecclesiastical development up to modern times.

On the whole, Christian thought has accepted Hebrew theories rather than the ideas of the Neo-Platonists in this matter. It insisted (though with occasional lapses) that the real root of sin lies not in the flesh but in the will. As St. Augustine said, 'I found that wickedness was no substance, but a perversity of will which turns aside from Thee, O God.' So too it has agreed with Aquinas in rejecting the doctrine of pre-existence and refusing to regard the body as an after-thought, though it has done so, one imagines, on grounds other than the curious argument which Aquinas used that, 'In the natural order, the imperfect cannot precede the perfect and the soul cannot exist before its perfection in the unity of body and soul' (p. 127).

The first half of this book is rather heavy reading, the quotation marks being spread somewhat thickly; but the last half, dealing with the contribution of modern thought and with some practical applications, is increasingly interesting. Dr. Townley Lord brings together much instructive and useful information relative to the bearing of philosophy and psychology

* *The Unity of Body and Soul*. By F. Townley Lord, D.D. pp. 256. (S.C.M., 1930. Price 8/6.)

upon the problem of personality, and he illustrates the urge in modern thought towards more careful study of the bodily factors in human life. We give one quotation rather fully because it both illustrates his careful choice of words and also embodies in a degree the conclusion of his thesis. He is suggesting that of the rival theories about the origin of the soul, the Graducian theory is most in accord with modern biology:

'On the evolutionary view, the emergence of mind, as we know it, would be explained as the emergence of certain factors at a certain point of organic development. Why not go the farther step and say that at a still higher level, *viz.* that characterized by the human nervous system, there appears a system of capacities which in their mature development we call soul? This view has the advantage of giving a unity to the whole creation, and has a cosmic grandeur about it. It is a stately and coherent view that by the processes which are the expression of God's will both soul and body come into being together in the normal process of development. Such a view does not necessarily endanger spiritual values, for we have now learned to make a real distinction between origin and value; nor does it necessarily materialise the soul, for the accepted principle of evolution to-day admits the emergence of *qualitatively* new factors' (p. 213).

Again, we appreciate the interesting and careful speculation which he makes of the way in which the future life may 'preserve the real values of personality as we know it.' But is there not some discrepancy between such a statement as 'The revivifying of the physical remains that are deposited in the tomb is a conception full of difficulties and one which was expressly rejected by St. Paul' (p. 252) and the earlier remark about the future life being 'not purely incorporeal. . . . Christ's risen body was in some sense continuous with the body which the disciples had known . . . it was in some kind of physical condition' (p. 53).

The concluding chapter on the True Sacramentalism is suggestive and treats of that attitude which will enable us to 'possess the beauty and harmony of life wherever it is to be found.' It thus forms a part of the practical application of the value of the body with which Dr. Townley Lord finds an ably written book.

J.P.H.

SHORT NOTICES.

The unspoken comment to-day on many a sermon is that of the lad who explained to his teacher the reason for the Eunuch's going on his way rejoicing: 'Philip had done a-preaching to him.' But preaching has not necessarily lost either its attraction or its power. Dr. Fort Newton* describes it as 'a Great Art'; and as long as it is regarded thus, and not just as a part of the customary ritual of the service, there is little doubt that it can retain its power despite all the counter-attractions of fiction and studies. Dr. Fort Newton's latest book is a helpful study in the art of preaching. Dr. Newton knows well the difficulties which the preacher has to meet and he discusses them with much experience. He writes clearly and well, with a capacity for a happy turn of phrase which remains embedded in the mind.

The Russian Church has been brought into prominence of late by the variously different factors of the Soviet persecution and the movement for reunion. Many will therefore welcome a study** of the Eastern Church

* *The New Preaching.* By J. Fort Newton, LL.D. (S.C.M. Price 5/-.)

** *The Eastern Orthodox Church.* By Stefan Zankow. (S.C.M. Price 5/-.)

by one of its leaders, which offers a concise statement of the essentials of Orthodoxy. The only comment we make is that it is surprising how frequently throughout the book the reader is assured that in this or that particular, Orthodox Christianity is 'thoroughly, primitively Christian.' We found no difficulty in believing it primitive, even archaic.

To understand the theological position of St. Augustine it is pre-eminently necessary to study his life: and so we welcome a book† which gives a brief but admirable study of the man and his environment. The charm of the character of Monica, who through years of patient prayer yearned over her son—then as great a sinner as he became a saint—was responsible for that later simplicity and joy in the prayers of Augustine which mark them as outstanding in the history of Christendom. From regarding Monica's words as 'womanish advices which I should blush to obey,' he later found them the door to joy and peace; and few other lives so admirably illustrate 'the expulsive power of a new affection.' As he himself wrote, 'Thou didst draw me out of all my most evil ways, to become a delight above all the allurements which I once pursued.' We commend this brief study as a real contribution towards the understanding of a great man.

We also commend very cordially a new translation‡ of the Psalms by Professor Gowen, partly because it is so beautifully printed, and also because its renderings speak of most careful scholarship and exhibit undoubted inspiration. Dr. Gowen reminds us that in spite of their prominence in worship, the Psalms remain a little-understood part of Holy Scripture. He has given immense labour towards remedying this, and his new translation, in which he attempts to regain the metrical and strophical plan of the original writers, will commend itself both for its beauty and for the new light which it throws on many difficult passages. An excellent introduction to the Psalter, a judicious use of textual notes and a Glossary all add to the usefulness of this work. No doubt we shall for many years continue in public worship to sing devoutly such a rubrical direction as 'Bind the sacrifice with cords even unto the horns of the altar,' or the injunction, 'And let all the people say Amen'; but it will add to the spiritual value of our worship if we use such a volume as this in our private studies. We have nothing but praise for it.

J.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

WILL RELIGION REVIVE?

SIR,

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

While I am grateful to Mr. C. H. D. Grimes for his kind appreciation of my article, I should like to correct a small misunderstanding on his part. In referring to the charabanc trips on Sundays from the village where I took the duty, I did not wish my readers to infer that I thought the absent incumbent guilty of any lack of enterprise. The incumbent in question happens to be particularly enterprising. But even had he been as little enterprising as I am myself, I should never have desired, by implication or otherwise, to chide him for it. If people prefer the seaside, I do not see why the incumbent of the deserted village should be blamed.

† *St. Augustine*. By Eleanor McDougall, M.A., D.Litt. Foreword by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet. (S.C.M. Price 3/6.)

‡ *The Psalms: A New Transcription and Translation*. By Herbert H. Gowen, D.D. (S.C.M. Price 7/6.)

In these days we all do as we like, and everybody, it is to be hoped, is quite satisfied. I was not finding fault either with the people or with their Vicar; I merely mentioned the charabanc trips because they seemed to me symptomatic of the influence of petrol upon the time-honoured activities of institutional religion in the country as well as in the town. We shall not affect the situation either by getting busy with stunts or by denouncing the irreligion of the masses. The decline in church-going has a lot further to go yet.

J. C. HARDWICK.

Partington Vicarage, Manchester.

SIR,

Miss Stiff wants us to be 'all or nothing men,' and accuses us of 'soppiness sometimes camouflaged as Christian charity.' The Church of England is nothing if not comprehensive, and presumably the all or nothing policy is equally right for Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals. How did it suit them in the Prayer Book controversy? Well, I for one must plead guilty to 'soppiness.' I minister in a one-church area to a little flock that may be described as having no intellectual interests. They know the difference between church and chapel, and between High and Low, and that is about all. They do not want to be taught anything about Modernism or Anglo-Catholicism or any other 'ism.' No preacher could desire a more attentive congregation, but if I display pamphlets in the church on 'What We Believe,' or what anybody else believes, they look the other way. On Easter Day one disappeared, it is true, but then there were sixty communicants and a full church in the evening.

What am I to do? Preach Modernism more boldly, and cut out all hymns that contain offending words or verses? I think not. A village pastor (it may be different in a large town) has to be all things to all men, and remember that his people expect 'the simple Gospel,' as simple as he can make it. He can read the Revised Version, abolish the worst hymns and use as many new prayers as he likes without offence. But he must not attempt to make good Modernists—he will be fortunate if he succeeds in making good Churchmen of any sort—let him aim at making good Christians. After all, as Mr. Bezzant reminds us, Modernism is an attitude in theology, not a body of conclusions.

Are there not many flocks like mine, and many others composed of those who like to be called thoughtful people, and those who hate being asked to think at all? And is not the Soapy-Samminess of the typical modern bishop, which Mr. Hardwick complains of, partly owing to this fact? By the way, some of my own relatives knew Soapy Sam—my mother was confirmed by him—and in spite of his unfortunate encounter with Huxley, I do not gather that he was either a fool or a humbug.

T. F. ROYDS.

Haughton Rectory, Stafford.

BISHOP SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

SIR,

The following notes taken down in shorthand from the last address given by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce to his Rural Deans four days before his death, 15th July, 1873, may, I think, be of interest to your readers:

'It is not in a light sense that I say this doctrine of Fasting Communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes

in a clearer spirit, and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself to prayer and Communion with his God; but on a mistaken notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. It is a detestable materialism. Philosophically it is a contradiction, because when the Celebration is over you may hurry away to a meal, and the process about which you were so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting.'

INCENSE AND RITUALISM.

'Now these and such things are honestly and truly alien to the Church of England. Do not hesitate to treat them as such. All this appears to me to indicate a fidgety anxiety to make everything in our churches assimilate to a foreign usage. There is a growing feeling which I can only describe as an "ashamedness" of the Anglican Church, as if our grand old Anglican Communion contrasted unfavourably with the Church of Rome. . . . The habitual language used by many men sounds as if they were ashamed of our Church and its position: it is a sort of apology for the Church of England as compared with the Church of Rome. Why! I would as soon think of apologizing for the virtue of my mother to a harlot. I abhor this fidgety desire to make everything un-Anglican. It is not a grand development, as some seem to think. It is a decrepitude. It is not something sublime and impressive, but something very feeble and contemptible.'

W.F.

PRELACY AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

SIR,

The proposal to appoint a Commission on Church and State had reference to a unanimous declaration of the Episcopate as to what the position would be in the last resort and when the mind of the Church had been fully made up. There seemed general agreement at the Church Assembly that the last resort had not been reached, and the Commission was approved with the hope that the last resort would not be reached, but not much was said as to the method of finding out the mind of the Church or when it could be said to be fully made up, and I would suggest that that matter might be looked into as it may have an important bearing on the work of the Commission.

From the report of the last Commission on Church and State, it seems clear that the general body of Church people had not then fully made up their minds that they wanted a self-governing Church and that most of them had not expressed their opinions on the subject, but that after the publication of the report of the Commission a campaign was started which resulted in the majority of people assenting some with greater enthusiasm than others to the passing of the Enabling Act. The Bishop of Durham was of opinion that the promoters of the Act did not make it clear what the effect would be, for he says that when the Act was passed he noted in his diary 'They brazenly assert that they have changed nothing.' The last Commission sat during the War when people had many other matters to attend to, and collecting the opinions of Church people on the subject was probably not easy and when there was a general movement in favour of self-government. People attracted by the argument that as Indian soldiers had done useful work during the War therefore India should have self-government may not have sufficiently considered whether the Indian soldiers were going to govern India or who would do so. In the same way

people may have been attracted by the view that the Church should be free to govern herself, as they believe in freedom and prefer life and liberty to death and slavery, but they may not have sufficiently considered who are meant by the Church who would be likely to do the governing and whether the others would wish to be governed by them. I would venture, then, to hope that the Commission of this year will, in the light of ten years' working of the Church Assembly, welcome as wide a range of opinions as possible as to whether the Assembly is fully representative of the general body of members of the Church of England. Some members of the last Commission considered that special representation would be needed for certain sections of the Community, and the late Master of Balliol in a memorandum said that a purely territorial basis was not adequate for representation for religious bodies, and that unless educationalists had separate representation the report of the Commission would prove a disappointing document to an increasing number of not unintelligent people. The importance of educationalists might be considered from different stand-points. The majority of Public School boys do not seem to have fully made up their minds that they want to be ordained, and it is possible that their headmasters may not have had much share in shaping ecclesiastical policy.

Then it is said to be important to obtain the goodwill of educationalists with regard to the Church's educational policy. If the educationalists shaped the Church's educational policy they might have goodwill towards their own handiwork, and a large proportion of the educationalists in Universities, public, secondary and primary schools are members of the Church of England. As they have their organisations, it would no doubt be possible to ascertain whether they consider that they are fully represented by the Church Assembly. The majority of the members of the last Commission seemed against the view of the late Master of Balliol as to separate representation, but that was before the Church Assembly came into being, and the matter might be reviewed in the light of experience.

In connection with the elections this year to the House of Laity, I have seen appeals made to get as many members elected as possible who belong to some party in the Church. There may be different opinions as to how far party appeals succeed, but if one party makes them another party is likely to do so also, and that may not increase the interest of people who do not belong to parties. The Headmaster of Harrow, in his recent book on education, made this reference to parties in the Church: 'Whilst these rivals fight one another the educated Laity from whom schoolmasters are drawn goes by on the other side and keeps out of it all.' It would seem desirable that arrangements should be made such that they will come into it all before the mind of the Church can be said to have been fully made up.

Then there is the question of the method of election to the Church Assembly. The last Commission did not seem to advocate the present indirect system of election as being the ideally best one but as being the most practical one under the circumstances. Whilst it may work satisfactorily with regard to uncontroversial subjects, it may not prove so satisfactory with regard to controversial subjects, and suggestions have been made that in the case of controversial subjects there should be either a referendum or a special election.

When our Church authorities seek to know the mind of the Church of England, it is important to recognize that that mind in its strongest affirmations and negations is not truly reflected by votes given in the Church Assembly as at present constituted.

OSWALD YOUNGHUSBAND.

WOMEN AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

SIR,

May I once again ask for the courtesy of a small space in your correspondence pages on the above subject?

In the letter from me you were good enough to publish in the March number of the *Modern Churchman* there is an unfortunate printer's error. I did not say that the Church work expected from the wife of a priest was 'needless.' The word I used was 'endless.' I should be very sorry to appear to decry, in any way, the valuable and certainly much needed work attempted by the wives of the clergy. It is partly because I believe this work to be much needed that I advocate an ordained ministry of women.

While realising that you wish to offer an *amende honorable* in the note you have appended to my letter, I cannot see that you have in any way logically enforced your argument for expediency. I have not 'missed your point.' It is perfectly clear to me, and whether the word 'woman' or 'women' is used does not in the least affect your theory of testing a vocation by means of another profession. All 'practical considerations' in Church policy must ultimately be tested individually. I am not unconscious of 'practical difficulties' arising, no human effort that is worth while is without them. But I maintain that those who hold to the principle of the priesthood of women should not be less courageous in their willingness to face them than they are in the carrying out of any other principle.

You say that you 'advocate the best method of achieving the principle practically,' but I would remind you that the concluding sentence in your editorial paragraph to which my first letter was a protest does not suggest any method of achievement. To say, 'it is lawful to have women priests, but certainly at present it is not expedient,' does not imply any kind of action to further the principle.

Refreshingly different are the words of the Rev. J. C. Hardwick in his article 'Will Religion Revive?' although not applied by him to the same subject. He says, 'the Modernist who palters, or is uncertain, or tries to compromise, will fail, and deserves to do so. He who hesitates is lost. It is the "all or nothing" men who win in the world, for they set the pace and the rest have to follow.' It is a little acceleration of pace that the advocates of the ministry of women are looking for.

EDITH ROGERS.

67 Avenue Wendt,
Geneva, Switzerland.

We are quite in favour of a little acceleration of pace. In the editorial criticized by Miss Rodgers we wrote: 'If women would be content for a generation or so to be ordained priests and to minister solely to communities of women and children, that would prove the best and surest stepping-stone to the unrestricted priesthood which men are permitted to exercise.'

This passage outlines a policy of progress—experimental progress. We quite realize that it is not so much as our correspondent would like, but 'half a loaf is better than no bread,' and 'he that goes slowly goes surely, and he that goes surely goes far.'—ED. M.C.